DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 095 729 HE 005 771

AUTHOR	Bower, James R.; And Others
TITLE	The AACRAO-AID Participant Selection and Placement Study. Report to the Office of International Training, Agency for International Development, U. S. Department of State.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Agency for International Development (Dept. of State), Washington, D.C. Office of International Training.
PUB DATE	Mar 71
NOTE	196p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, 1 Dupont Circle, Suite 330, Washington, D. C. 20036
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$9.00 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; College Students; *Exchange Programs; *Foreign Students; *Higher Education; *International Programs; Program Evaluation; Research Projects; Selection; *Student Placement; Success Factors

ABSTRACT

The U. S. Agency for International Development (AID) contracted with the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) to provide professional consultant services and academic credential analysts to improve the selection and admission of AID-sponsored participants (foreign students) for study in U. S. academic institutions of higher education. This study assesses the effectiveness of the selection and placement of AID-sponsored academic participants in U. S. universities and colleges and suggests how the total process can be improved. Summary observations and recommendations concern: the participant and what he accomplished, assessment of tests and the prediction potential, some particular points for the attention of management, recommendations for AID, study outcomes as seen from an institutional viewpoint, and study outcomes from the viewpoint of international educational exchanges. (MJM)

ED 095729

THE AACRAO-AID PARTICIPANT SELECTION AND PLACEMENT STUDY

REPORT TO THE OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAINING
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20523

MARCH 1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Submitted by The AACRAO-AID Study Committee:

James R. Bower, University of Michigan
J. Douglas Conner, Executive Secretary, AACRAO
Ellsworth M. Gerritz, Kansas State University
Hattie Jarmon, Office of International Training, AID/Washington
Albert G. Sims, College Entrance Examination Board
Robert E. Tschan, Pennsylvania State University
Lee Wilcox, University of Wisconsin, Vice-Chairman
Clyde Vroman, University of Michigan, Chairman

HE 005 771

Copies may be ordered from:

The American Association of Collegiate
Registrars and Admissions Officers
1 Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036

CONTENTS

Pages*

FOREWORD 1

PREFACE .. .. 1 - 3

ABSTRACT OF MAJOR FINDINGS .. .. 1 - 3

CHAPTER

I *BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION* .. .. 1 - 6

II *METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY* .. .. 1 - 6

III *DESCRIPTION OF PARTICIPANTS* .. .. 1 - 12

IV *ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS AT TIME OF ARRIVAL* .. .. 1 - 17

V *PLACEMENT OF PARTICIPANTS* .. .. 1 - 23

VI *ENGLISH LANGUAGE* .. .. 1 - 30

VII *ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE* .. .. 1 - 18

VIII *PREDICTION OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS* .. .. 1 - 17

IX *SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS* .. .. .. 1 - 14

GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ACRONYMS 1

LIST OF TABLES .. .. 1 - 5

APPENDIXES

A. Case Descriptions .. .. 1 - 13
B. Project Implementation Order/Participants (PIO/P) .. 1 - 3
C. Participant Biographical Data (Bio-Data) .. .. .. 1 - 3
D. Credential Analyst Worksheet (CAW) .. .. 1 - 3
E. Participant Questionnaire (PQ) .. .. 1 - 2
F. Campus Participant Questionnaire (CPQ) .. .. .. 1 - 2
G. Graduate Student Supplement #1 (For CPQ) .. .. .. 1 - 2
H. U.S. Universities and Colleges Which Enrolled The Participants and Furnished Campus Representatives .. 1 - 8

---

*Pages are numbered sequentially within each chapter or section.

FOREWORD

On behalf of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers (AACRAO) we are pleased to submit this Participant Selection and Placement Study to Mr. Robert E. Matteson, Director, Office of International Training, Agency for International Development (AID), Department of State. The Study culminates six years of gratifying cooperation between AACRAO and AID and particularly the past three years during which the research reported herein was conducted.

No longitudinal study of foreign students comparable in purpose, scope, and depth has been done before in our country. The unusual characteristic of the Study is that it represents a concentrated, joint effort by our government and our universities and colleges to improve the selection and placement of sponsored foreign students in U.S. institutions of higher education. The Report contains a great deal of information not previously available which can be used with benefit by policy makers, administrators, and professional personnel. The preliminary draft of the Report, dated November, 1970, was used as the basic working document for the National Conference on "University-Government Cooperation in Programs for Students from Abroad: An Assessment Based on an AACRAO-AID Study," held on December 8 and 9, 1970. This final edition of the Report has been revised to reflect clarifications which resulted from the Conference. The published results of that Conference will constitute a functional sequel to this Report. Together the two publications should serve as a foundation for widespread evaluation and improvement of services to all foreign students.*

The Report is organized around chapters which cover the major divisions of the Study. Pages are numbered sequentially within each Chapter. Readers should first familiarize themselves with the Preface, the page of Contents, the Abstract, and the Glossary, which follows Chapter IX. Then a sequential reading of the nine chapters will be fruitful. The case descriptions presented in Appendix A will humanize the inanimate mass data in the Report. Other Appendixes show some of the major forms with which the research was carried on.

AACRAO wishes to express its appreciation to the many persons who have made this Study possible, particularly to Director Robert E. Matteson and his staff; to Miss Hattie Jarmon, Chief of the Academic Advisory Staff; to the members of the AACRAO-AID Study Committee; and to Miss Diane E. Henderson for her editorial and secretarial skills.

Clyde Vroman, Chairman
AACRAO-AID Project Director

---

*Copies of this Study Report and the Conference Report may be ordered from AACRAO, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C., 20036

PREFACE

The Office of International Training of the Agency for International Development is pleased to be able to bring to the attention of the international education community, and the American universities and colleges in particular, this AACRAO-AID Participant Selection and Placement Study. It represents an important landmark both as a creative partnership between the universities and the government that has characterized our international development assistance effort from the very beginning, and as a significant contribution to the improvement in the quality of the selection and placement of all foreign students.

Participant training is an integral part of the technical assistance effort that is at the center of any effective and lasting international development enterprise. It is one of the most important, but, to the American public, least known aspects of the United States foreign assistance program. As used in A.I.D., it consists of training and educating, in the United States and certain other countries, qualified, carefully selected foreign nationals who then return to their home countries better prepared to participate in their own national development activities. All such training is related to specific development goals.

Since the beginning of the United States foreign assistance program more than 150,000 such "participants" have undertaken training under these auspices. During each of the past four fiscal years between 13,000 and 15,000 have been in training--more than 10,000 annually in the United States alone. The Office of International Training administers this program--assisted by more than a score of other Federal agencies and hundreds of local governmental and private institutions and organizations.

The training offered is designed to improve the technical capabilities of the participants, broaden their outlook on the modernization process, and help them understand this country and its ideals. Participants have been trained, individually and in groups, for varying periods of time in a wide range of subjects--e.g., agriculture, public administration, industry, education, health, and labor. Training is of four types: academic (enrollment in university programs), observations (short-term exposure to facilities and processes--usually for groups, occasionally at very high levels of responsibility), on-the-job (learning by doing, at the training facility--usually industrial or agricultural), and specialized (tailored for a very tightly delineated objective).

Selection of persons with attitudes and aptitudes that promise success is the key to an effective program in all these types of training. Poor selection wastes time, money, and effort and leads to great frustration on all sides. About half the participants in Fiscal Year 1970 (6,939) were in academic training; and since academic training constitutes a growing proportion of all training supported by A.I.D. and generally represents a greater commitment of time, energy, and money than any other type, selection criteria that are highly predictive of success are a matter of greatest importance. This report is based on the sample consisting of 1,142 academic participants who arrived in the United States in 1967 and 1968. This represents about one-sixth of the academic participants arriving in the United States in those two years.

The survey on which the present Study is based began three years ago as an effort to identify some predictive factors with respect to academic performance that would assist our Mission directors and training officers abroad, as well as the foreign government and university officials with whom they deal, in the selection and preparation of their nationals for placement in academic programs in the United States. We also hoped that in addition the Study would have some value for the broader group that we call the international education community.

I believe that the Study has effectively served both purposes. The findings will be very useful to us as we attempt to set the guidelines for our representatives abroad and will be invaluable to those representatives in their relations with the governmental and educational officials with whom they are working. I would hope that they will have comparable utility for others in the field of international education, including those many foreign students who come to the United States each year on their own.

On behalf of the administrator of A.I.D., I want to commend Dr. Clyde Vroman, Director of Admissions at The University of Michigan, and his colleagues on the Committee, who have worked hard, long, and well to produce an honest and useful report. They were, in the literal sense of the word, a harmonious, working Committee. They were effectively led by Dr. Vroman and helpfully assisted by Miss Hattie Jarmon of my staff--to whom a special word of commendation and appreciation must go.

It is my earnest hope that this Study will receive wide dissemination within the community to which it is addressed. The reader will be rewarded for the attention he gives to it.

Robert E. Matteson
Director
Office of International Training

ABSTRACT OF MAJOR FINDINGS

Chapters I and II describe the background and methodology of the Study. The findings appear in Chapters III--VIII and are interpreted in Chapter IX. Major findings of Chapters III through VIII are abstracted below:

Chapter III. Description of Participants

The AID-sponsored academic participants surveyed represent about one-sixth of this type of participant arriving in the United States in 1967 and 1968. They were diverse in geographic origin, age, and occupation, had widely varying objectives, and differed significantly from the total foreign student population on geographic and field of study comparisons. They were not typical foreign students, and caution should therefore be exercised in interpreting the findings of this Study and applying them to other groups. A.I.D. participants seemed to be more mature, more established occupationally, and more likely to study for teaching and other public-service positions. They clearly saw their programs as related to the development of their countries. In addition to their academic background, these students seemed to have other important strengths, such as maturity and demonstrated abilities.

Chapter IV. Academic Qualifications at Time of Arrival

The A.I.D. academic participants appeared to be a generally well-qualified group of students whose previous academic study was relevant for their training objective. Almost all of them reported that they ranked in the top half of the class at home. The credential analysts and AAS/W rated the previous academic study of about half of them as above average in quality and agreed that 80 percent were capable of doing satisfactory work in a U.S. university or college of average academic competition on the campus.

Chapter V. Placement of Participants

The field of study expected by participants agreed with their prescribed majors 65 percent of the time, and credential analysts and campus representatives agreed on degree objectives for 72.8 percent. These differences may stem from semantics, variations in institutional practices, or communication difficulties with the participant.

Credential analysts in Washington found 67 percent of the participants' dossiers complete for evaluation purposes, while campus representatives reported 75.3 percent adequate for placement; thus it appears that admissions officers have permitted participants to enroll while the missing credentials were obtained. The types of admission granted appear to be normal and appropriate; only three percent of the undergraduates and 13.2 percent of the graduates were admitted to regular degree status with deficiencies--a commendable situation for foreign students.

Recommendations by the A.I.D. Missions coincided with actual institutional placement of participants in two-fifths of the cases; institutional placement recommendations of the AAS/W agreed with the actual institutional placement in three-fifths of the cases.

Chapter VI. English Language

The participants in this Study came to the United States with a wide variety of English language background. English proficiency test scores indicated that between one-third and one-half of the participants lacked sufficient command of English to begin a full academic program on arrival. Fifteen percent required full-time English instruction before academic enrollment and 45 percent were required to take English concurrently with their regular academic work. About one-half of the cases were handled in accordance with the formal A.I.D. English languag guidelines.

Chapter VII. Academic Performance

With few exceptions, A.I.D. participants' academic performance compares very favorably with that of most American students and is superior to that of other foreign students. Over 90 percent of the undergraduate and 75 percent of the graduate participants earned satisfactory grades during the first year; only eight percent were placed on academic probation. More than 85 percent successfully met their training objective.

Chapter VIII. Prediction of Academic Success

The SAT-Math was a surprisingly good predictor of undergraduate performance. Verbal scores on U.S. aptitude tests (SAT or GRE), however, were of little predictive value. English proficiency tests consistently had significant correlations with performance in terms of credit hours, but used alone the usefulness of ALI/GU or TOEFL in predicting grades was marginal. Rank in class, as reported by the participant, was virtually useless as a predictor. Among the ratings of the quality of the participant's record, the rating made on the campus was, as expected, the most predictive of success. Correlations with GPA compared favorably with all other criteria.

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

Purposes of the Study.

In June 1964 the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID)[1] contracted with the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) to provide professional consultant services and academic credential analysts to improve the selection and admission of AID-sponsored participants (foreign students) for study in U.S. academic institutions of higher education. This continuing contractual arrangement has been called the "AACRAO-AID Project." Two years of subsequent activities and services made clear the need for a systematic study of background information on AID participants and follow-up of their success in training programs in U.S. universities and colleges.

The processes of selection and placement of AID participants occur in three clearly separate locations:

1. In the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) Missions overseas.
2. In the AID Office of International Training (AID/OIT), Washington, D.C.
3. In U.S. universities and colleges.

The central purposes of this Study are to evaluate procedures and guidelines and to suggest modifications which will enable the USAID Missions overseas, AID/OIT in Washington, and U.S. universities and colleges to carry out their individual responsibilities for the selection and placement of the participants most efficiently and successfully.

At the Mission level AACRAO through this Study seeks to assist U.S. officials in working with the host-country governments in estimating who will be successful in U.S. training programs and in the selection of participants.

---

[1] A glossary of special terms and acronyms follows Chapter IX.

In Washington AACRAO seeks to assist the AID Office of International Training (AID/OIT) to carry out, at the highest possible level of professional excellence, its academic evaluation and advisory services to other divisions of OIT and to various federal agencies which place the participants in U.S. institutions.

For U.S. universities and colleges AACRAO seeks to provide admissions officers, graduate deans, and departmental chairmen with full information, academic credentials, professional evaluations, and recommendations which will assist them in making prompt and wise decisions concerning the admission and placement of AID-sponsored, academic participants.

In 1966 the Project centered its attention on the possible uses of tests in the assessment, selection, preparation, and placement of participants in academic programs. It was hoped particularly that ways could be found to use tests in predicting academic success.

In 1967 AACRAO and AID launched a broad-based, longitudinal study to be carried on over a period of several years under the title, "The AACRAO-AID Participant Selection and Placement Study." The goal was not only to find valid uses of tests but also to provide a thorough foundation of facts and outcomes with which to continuously assess and improve the entire participant selection and placement process. It was expected that this Study also would make a major contribution to the processes of admission and placement of other foreign students who enter U.S. universities and colleges each year.

The Study covers 1142 participants who arrived in the U.S. in 1967 and 1968. This group consists of 1004 participants who were programmed through the Office of International Training and 138 participants who were programmed by universities with AID contracts (called "contract participants"). The participants were brought specifically to study in academic programs, most of which were to lead to a degree. All of them were given standardized tests of English as a foreign language and scholastic aptitude tests. Over 100 items of data eventually were collected on each participant during his stay in the U.S. These data provide the information base for this Study and are described in the next chapter.

In summary, the broad purposes of this Study are (1) to assess the effectiveness of the selection and placement of AID-sponsored, academic participants in U.S. universities and colleges, and (2) to suggest how the total process can be improved.

The Selection and Placement Processes.

The processes and conditions of bringing AID-sponsored participants to the U.S. are substantially different from the system under which unsponsored foreign students come to our universities and colleges. Nonsponsored students have alternative choices and decisions about their education which they can make as they wish. On the other hand, the AID participant is limited to the particular training program approved for him and to which he agrees when he accepts AID sponsorship of his study in the U.S. He also agrees to study at the particular institution in which he is placed by AID/OIT or a participating agency. Following are the three major locations of planning and the steps that result in his enrollment in a U.S. university or college.

1. In the Missions Overseas. The first step is the formulation, by the government of the U.S. and the government of the cooperating country, of a program of social and economic development for that country. The results of this planning may include a Project Implementation Order/Participants (PIO/P, see Appendix B) which clearly defines the scope and requirements of the academic training desired for each participant. A copy of the PIO/P

precedes the participant to AID/OIT in Washington and specifies clearly the objectives and conditions of his education in the U.S.

The second step overseas is the selection of participants. The qualifications on which a participant is judged are the following:

a. Qualities of maturity, leadership, and outstanding career potential.

b. Understanding of the problems in the "cooperating (his) country" related to the area of proposed training.

c. Sufficient training or experience in the field of proposed training or related areas to enable the participant to take full advantage of and benefit adequately from the training program.

d. Acceptance of an obligation to work in the field of specialization in the cooperating country after completion of training.

e. Adequate command of English.

f. Physical fitness.

Each participant is selected and jointly approved by his government and the Mission. In approving the selection of participants the Mission has in mind that AID-sponsored training is designed to contribute to progress on and accomplishment of goals previously agreed upon jointly by his government and the government of the U.S., rather than to the personal enhancement of the individual concerned. A "dossier," consisting of a Participant Biographical Data form (Bio-Data, see Appendix C), plus the PIO/P and transcripts of academic record and other documents, is prepared by the Mission and sent to AID/OIT, which will seek admission for him to some appropriate university or college in the U.S.

2. In AID/OIT, Washington. Upon receipt of an approved academic participant's dossier of materials from the Mission, AID/OIT, or a participating federal agency, makes arrangements with a U.S. university or college to enroll the participant for the program of studies desired. In this process

the Academic Advisory Staff/OIT and AACRAO credential analysts evaluate the participant's dossier and make recommendations for the use of the Development Training Specialist, formerly called Program Development Officer, concerning the placement of the participant in a U.S. university or college. For that purpose a Credential Analysts Worksheet (CAW) was developed for the Study. Since May 1969, it has been the policy of AID/OIT to send a copy of the completed CAW form with each participant's credentials when they are forwarded to an institution for admission and placement decisions. Each U.S. institution is free, of course, to accept or reject the participants and/or the recommendations of their CAW forms.

When arrangements for the participant's training programs are satisfactory, the Mission is sent a "Call Forward" and the participant departs for the U.S.

3. In U.S. Universities and Colleges. The dossiers of AID participants are sent to institutions in the U.S. by AID/OIT and its participating federal agencies in Washington. The decisions concerning admission and placement in U.S. universities and colleges are made in the usual way by the admission officers, graduate deans, and/or departmental chairmen.

At each of the 203 institutions at which the participants in this Study have enrolled, arrangements were made for an AACRAO member at that institution to serve as the "campus representative" for this Study. (For a list of those institutions, see Appendix H.) His responsibility has been to furnish information about the admission and placement processes of the AID participants and to furnish academic transcripts and other information at appropriate times.

In summary, the participants selected to come to the U.S. are not necesarily those with the highest academic records. Rather they are the ones judged, by their governments and the Mission officers, to be the best qualified by maturity and demonstrated abilities to return to the service of their countries in specific occupations upon completion of their training programs in the U.S.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Since the Study was intended to assess the effectiveness and success of the AID selection and placement process, each data element collected was chosen for its potential contribution toward answering one or more of the following major study questions:

1. What were the demographic characteristics of AID participants?
2. What were the educational qualifications of participants at the time of their arrival?
3. How well did participants perform academically and did they accomplish their training objectives?
4. What role did English language proficiency play in the performance of participants?
5. To what extent could test scores and other preadmission variables be used to predict the success of participants?
6. How well did the AID selection and placement process work for academic participants?
7. What recommendations can be made to improve the AID selection and placement system for academic participants?

Study Sample.

The intent in drawing the sample of AID participants for the Study was to select the first 1000 noncontract participants who arrived in the U.S. for academic study in the summer of 1967. It was anticipated that approximately that number would enter the U.S. in the summer of 1967 and would thus constitute the sample. Fewer participants were enrolled in the Study in 1967 than had been expected and the entry period was extended through the summer of 1968 in order to reach the 1000 participant goal. A group of 100 Vietnamese who entered the U.S. in February of 1967 for a special six-month English language/orientation program was also included beginning in September 1967.

Each participant was expected to complete a questionnaire, two English tests and a scholastic aptitude test upon arrival. It was not possible to schedule all participants to complete all these requirements. Those who did not complete the questionnaire and at least one of the three tests were dropped from the Study. The basic sample for the Study thus consisted of 1004 noncontract academic participants who arrived in the U.S. in 1967 or 1968 and 138 contract participants who entered the U.S. during the same period. The contract participants are not included in this report since their selection and placement processes differ.

Data Collection.

A wide variety of data was collected about each participant. The various sources and data items are as follows:

1. Participant Biographical Data (Form AID 1380-2, see Appendix C).

   These data were completed by the participant and the Mission.

   - Date of birth
   - Sex
   - Marital status
   - Country
   - Geographic area
   - Present and future occupation and economic activity
   - Test waiver
   - Previous travel abroad--location, duration, purpose

2. Credential Analysts Worksheet (AACRAO-AID Form 6704, see Appendix D).

   This form was completed by an AACRAO credential analyst experienced in the evaluation of foreign educational credentials based on a review of the participant's PIO/P and academic credentials.

   - Major and degree objective
   - Completeness of credentials
   - Type of secondary school

Years of elementary-secondary school; home university admissibility

Post secondary institutions attended

Highest degree earned

Appropriateness of previous preparation*

Quality of academic record*

Placement level recommendation*

Competitiveness of U.S. placement*

Institutions recommended by Mission and AAS

---

*Also rated by the Academic Advisory Staff/OIT.

3. Participant Questionnaire (AACRAO-AID Form 6702, see Appendix E).

Each participant filled out this questionnaire during his first week in the U.S. under standardized conditions.

Language spoken in home, secondary school, and university; country language

Amount of previous English study

Least and most difficult areas of English

Estimate of overall English adequacy

Estimated rank in class

Years out of school

Expected field of study and degree

Level felt qualified to begin

Several perceptions of the selection process

4. Test Information.

Arrangements were made for all participants, upon arrival in the U.S., to take the three written tests of the American Language Institute, Georgetown University (ALI/GU), the Test of English as a Foreign Language

(TOEFL), and the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or the Graduate Record Examination (GRE) depending upon whether the participant was an undergraduate or a graduate student. In addition, the ALI/GU scores achieved overseas that were intended to determine the participant's readiness for study in the U.S. were also collected. These tests, as administered, consisted of the following parts:

- ALI/GU (overseas)
    - Usage
    - Oral
    - Vocabulary/Reading
    - Listening
- ALI/GU (U.S.)
    - Usage
    - Vocabulary/Reading
    - Listening
- TOEFL (U.S.)
    - Listening Comprehension
    - English Structure
    - Vocabulary
    - Reading Comprehension
    - Writing Ability
    - Total
- SAT (U.S.)
    - Verbal
    - Math
- GRE (U.S.)
    - Verbal
    - Quantitative

5. Campus Participant Questionnaire (CPQ, AACRAO-AID Form 6706, see Appendix F).

An AACRAO representative on the campus where the participant was originally placed for academic work was asked to complete this form in consultation with other campus officials at the end of the participant's first academic year.

Institution

Major and degree objective

Type of admission

Completeness of credentials

Required preparatory work in academic or English courses

Level at which participant was placed

Appropriateness of previous preparation

Quality of previous academic record

Unusual program changes

Unusual personal, social or health problems

6. Academic Transcripts.

Each U.S. institution attended by a participant was requested to supply a transcript showing courses taken and grades received beginning with initial registration through withdrawal or the end of the fall semester (or winter quarter) of 1969-1970 whichever occurred first. Degrees awarded were collected through the second semester of 1969-1970.

Credits attempted--first term, second term, first year

Credits earned--first term, second term, first year, second year

Proportion of full load--first term, first year

Grade-point average (GPA)--first term, second term, first year, second year

Achievement Index--first term, second term, first year, second year (an index of performance including both quality and quantity of work completed which is explained more fully in Chapter VIII, page 3).

Degree received in the U.S.

7. Graduate Student Supplement (AACRAO-AID Form 6706e, see Appendix G).

The faculty person most knowledgeable about each graduate participant was asked to rate his overall academic performance.

Rating--compared with other foreign students in the field at his level

Rating--compared with all other students in the field at his level

For some of the variables involved in the Study, complete data are available. For a number of variables, however, there are missing data. Both the participants and the campus representatives completed questionnaires. Some questions were unanswered. Some participants did not complete all tests. A few institutions did not provide transcripts. The Study Committee believes, nevertheless, that the data collected provide an adequate information base for this Study.

The coding and punching of every data item were carefully verified. Although a great amount of time was spent in this verification process, it was considered a crucial aspect of the data collection in order that the results could be used with confidence.

CHAPTER III

DESCRIPTION OF PARTICIPANTS

The purpose of this chapter is to describe some of the demographic characteristics of the participants and several of their perceptions about the selection process. This description should be useful in assessing the extent to which results may be generalized to other foreign student populations.

Table III-1 shows the countries from which the participants came and Table III-2 provides a geographic comparison of the study group with all foreign students in the U.S. in 1969.[1]

TABLE III-1

PARTICIPANTS' HOME COUNTRIES

COUNTRY	N	%
AFRICA		
Congo (Kinshasa)	5	.5
Ethiopia	83	8.2
Ghana	4	.4
Ivory Coast	1	.1
Kenya	22	2.2
Liberia	10	1.0
Malagasy	1	.1
Malawi	22	2.2
Nigeria	8	.8
Sierra Leone	2	.2
Somali Republic	8	.8
Tanzania	7	.7
Togo	1	.1
Tunisia	17	1.7
Uganda	21	2.1
Zambia	39	3.9
Subtotal..	251	25.0
FAR EAST		
Indonesia	52	5.2
Korea	22	2.2
Philippines	2	.2
Taiwan	8	.8
Thailand	104	10.3
Vietnam	300	29.9
Subtotal..	488	48.6
LATIN AMERICA		
Argentina	13	1.3
Bolivia	4	.4
Brazil	72	7.1
Chile	19	1.9
Colombia	6	.6
Costa Rica	2	.2
El Salvador	4	.4
Guatemala	5	.5
Guyana	1	.1
Honduras	6	.6
Jamaica	2	.2
Nicaragua	5	.5
Paraguay	3	.3
Peru	1	.1
Venezuela	3	.3
Subtotal..	146	14.5
NEAR EAST/SOUTHEAST ASIA		
Afghanistan	9	.9
India	10	1.0
Iran	1	.1
Jordan	9	.9
Nepal	15	1.5
Pakistan	32	3.2
Turkey	43	4.3
Subtotal..	119	11.9
Total.....	1004	100.0

---

[1] Data on foreign students in the U.S. from OPEN DOORS 1970, Institute of International Education, New York.

TABLE III-2

GEOGRAPHIC ORIGIN OF AID PARTICIPANTS AND ALL FOREIGN STUDENTS IN THE U.S.

Area	AID Participants (%)	All Foreign Students (%)
Africa	25.0	5.6
Europe	-	13.7
Far East	48.6	28.1
Latin America	14.5	18.5
NE/SA	11.9	19.6
North America		10.0
Oceania	-	1.5
Unknown	-	3.0
Total...	100.0	100.0

Comments:

1. Although 44 countries are represented in this sample, it should be noted that two countries, Thailand and Vietnam, supply 40% of the sample.
2. There is a marked difference in the geographic origin of AID participants compared with all foreign students. Nearly three-fourths of the Study sample comes from the Far East or Africa compared with about one-third of the total foreign student population in the U.S. from these two areas.

The placement level of each participant was assessed by reference to the level at which the institution said he was placed or, if that question was unanswered, by the level of courses taken, or, if a transcript was not received, by the level at which the AACRAO credential analyst indicated he was qualified to begin.

The level at which the participants were placed is shown by geographic area in Table III-3. The placement level of all foreign students in the U.S. in 1969[1] is also indicated.

---

[1] Ibid.

TABLE III-3

PLACEMENT LEVEL AND GEOGRAPHIC AREA OF PARTICIPANTS

	Undergraduate		Graduate		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
AFRICA	137	31.2	114	20.1	251	25.0
FAR EAST	257	58.7	231	40.8	488	48.6
LATIN AMERICA	20	4.6	126	22.3	146	14.5
NE/SA	24	5.5	95	16.8	119	11.9
Total...	438	100.0	566	100.0	1004	100.0
% AID	43.6		56.4		100.0	
% All Foreign Students*	47.0		47.0			

---

*Six percent of these students were not classified as to placement level.

Comments:

1. In the total sample, 56% of the participants are at the graduate level.
2. Africa and the Far East account for about 90% of the undergraduate sample.
3. The graduate sample is more evenly distributed geographically than undergraduates.
4. The proportion of undergraduate and graduate students is roughly the same in the Study as in the U.S. as a whole.

Table III-4 shows the sex and marital status of the participants in the sample.

TABLE III-4

SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF PARTICIPANTS

			Total		
	Single	Married	N	% AID	% All Foreign Students[1]
Male	434	383	817	81.4	75.0
Female	157	30	187	18.6	25.0
Total--N	591	413	1004		
%	58.9	41.1		100.0	100.0

---

[1] Ibid.

Comments:

1. The sample is predominantly male (81%). This is about the same as in the total foreign student population (75%).
2. Two out of five participants are married (41%).
3. Proportionately more males are married than are females.
4. Data were not available on the extent to which participants' families were in the U.S.

The ages of participants at the time they entered the U.S. is shown in Table III-5.

TABLE III-5

AGE OF PARTICIPANTS

Age	N	%
Under 21	129	12.9
21-25	191	19.0
26-30	319	31.7
31-35	240	23.9
36-40	81	8.1
Over 40	44	4.4
Total...	1004	100.0

Comments:

1. The median age in this group is 28.
2. While two-thirds of the participants are over 25 years of age, more than three-fifths are under 31.

Not only do participants tend to be mature, they tend to have been out of school for some time as shown in Table III-6 which follows.

TABLE III-6

YEARS SINCE PARTICIPANTS' LAST SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

	N	%
Less than 1 year	121	13.8
1 but less than 2 years	140	16.0
2 but less than 3 years	106	12.1
3 but less than 4 years	99	11.3
4 but less than 5 years	84	9.6
5 but less than 7 years	166	19.0
8 but less than 10 years	88	10.0
11 to 15 years	49	5.6
16 to 20 years	10	1.1
Over 20 years	13	1.5
Total...	876	100.0
Not available	128	
	1004	

Comment. Over half (58%) of the participants had been out of school three or more years and over 86% of the participants had been out of school one or more years.

Many participants had established occupations prior to their selection for U.S. training. Table III-7 shows the occupational categories (as defined by AID) of the participants at the time of selection and the occupational categories planned upon their return. Table III-8 shows whether their future employer is in the public or private sector.

TABLE III-7

PRESENT AND FUTURE OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES OF PARTICIPANTS

Category	Present N	Present %	Future N	Future %
Policy Maker, Executive and Administrator	16	1.6	16	2.0
Program and Administrative Official	247	25.0	190	23.4
Engineers	33	3.3	51	6.3
Professional--(e.g., teacher, architect, scientist)	390	39.4	463	56.9
Subprofessional	71	7.1	54	6.6
Supervisor, Inspector, Foreman	10	1.0	7	0.9
Artisan, Craftsman	6	0.6	5	0.6
Other	218	22.0	27	3.3
Total...	991	100.0	813	100.0
Not available	13		191	
	1004		1004	

TABLE III-8

FUTURE EMPLOYER OF PARTICIPANTS

	N	%
Public	928	96.0
Private	22	2.3
Joint	16	1.7
Total...	966	100.0
Not available	38	
	1004	

Comments:

1. The vast majority of the participants are in professional positions at the time of their selection and will return to professional positions. Only 2% of the participants are in high policy-making positions in government.
2. Virtually all the participants will be employed upon return in public as distinct from private enterprise.

The major fields of study of the participants as prescribed by the USAID Mission and the host government are shown in Table III-9.

TABLE III-9

PARTICIPANTS' MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY

	N	% AID	% All Foreign Students[1]
Agriculture	139	13.8	2.7
Biological Science	38	3.8	*
Business	86	8.6	11.5
Education	279	27.8	5.8
Engineering	129	12.8	22.0
Health Science	57	5.7	4.4
Home Economics	8	.8	
Humanities	15	1.5	19.6
Physical Sciences	56	5.6	15.9
Social Sciences	197	19.6	12.8
Total...	1004	100.0	94.7
Unknown			5.3

*Combined with Physical Sciences.

---

[1] Ibid.

Comments:

1. The fields of study most prevalent in the Study sample were education (27.7%), social science (19.6%), agriculture (13.9%) and engineering (12.9%).
2. There are marked differences between the fields represented in the Study and those of all foreign students. Over 60% of the participants were in education, social science or agriculture, while these three fields account for only 21% of all foreign students. On the other hand, engineering and science accounted for 22% in the AID sample compared with 38% of all foreign students.

The degree objectives prescribed for the participants' training programs are shown in Table III-10.

TABLE III-10

PARTICIPANTS' DEGREE OBJECTIVE

Degree	N	%
Bachelor's	272	27.1
Master's	458	45.6
Doctor's	35	3.5
Other	5	.5
None	234	23.3
Total...	1004	100.0

Comment. Over three-fourths of the participants are studying in degree programs, with the Master's degree the most frequent objective.

Participant Selection.

Because participants entered the Study at the time of their arrival in the U.S., no attempt was made to gather comprehensive information on the manner in which they were chosen overseas for the AID academic training program. However, the questionnaire contained three questions related to the participants' perceptions of the selection process. To assess whether the participants sought the training or whether they were designated for it, they were asked, "Were you asked to apply for this AID Program?"

TABLE III-11

EXTENT TO WHICH PARTICIPANTS WERE ASKED TO APPLY FOR THE AID ACADEMIC TRAINING PROGRAM

	N	%
Were asked to apply	587	70.0
Were not asked to apply	252	30.0
Total...	839	100.0
Not answered	165	
Total...	1004	

Comment. Seventy percent of the participants were asked to apply for assignment. This emphasizes that the process is not a typical foreign student admissions situation.

The participants whose answers are reported above came from 45 different countries. The practices varied considerably among some of those countries as stated in Table III-12 below. It shows the total responses of the 14 countries which were represented by 15 or more participants. Countries are ranked in order of the percentage of each country's participants who replied that they had been "asked to apply."

TABLE III-12

EXTENT TO WHICH PARTICIPANTS IN 14 COUNTRIES WITH 15 OR MORE PARTICIPANTS WERE ASKED TO APPLY FOR THE AID ACADEMIC TRAINING PROGRAM

	Yes		No		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Korea	17	94.4	1	5.6	18	100.0
Tunisia	15	88.2	2	11.8	17	100.0
Thailand	80	83.3	16	16.7	96	100.0
Indonesia	40	83.3	8	16.7	48	100.0
Brazil	55	78.6	15	21.4	70	100.0
Turkey	32	78.0	9	22.0	41	100.0
Uganda	14	77.8	4	22.2	18	100.0
Pakistan	22	75.9	7	24.1	29	100.0
Ethiopia	52	69.3	23	30.7	75	100.0
Chile	11	64.7	6	35.3	17	100.0
Zambia	23	62.2	14	37.8	37	100.0
Kenya	13	61.9	8	38.1	21	100.0
Malawi	13	61.9	8	38.1	21	100.0
Vietnam	97	52.2	89	47.8	186	100.0

N = 694

Comment. The percentages of participants who answered "yes", indicating that they were asked to apply for the AID academic training program, varies considerably among the several home countries, ranging from 94.4% (Korea) down to 52.2% (Vietnam).

Upon arrival in the U.S., participants in this Study were asked to indicate how important they felt certain qualifications were in their being selected for the AID academic training program. (See Appendix E, Participant Questionnaire, question 20.) Table III-13, which follows, presents their replies on a three-part scale.

TABLE III-13

PARTICIPANTS' RATINGS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF CERTAIN QUALIFICATIONS IN THEIR BEING ACCEPTED FOR THE AID ACADEMIC TRAINING PROGRAM

	Very Important		Some Importance		Not Important		Total		Not Available
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
a. Academic record	561	67.5	242	29.1	28	3.4	831	100.0	173
b. Job experience	595	72.2	187	22.7	42	5.1	824	100.0	180
c. Personal contacts	188	25.1	283	37.8	277	37.1	748	100.0	256
d. English proficiency	408	52.0	318	40.5	59	7.5	785	100.0	219

Comments:

1. All four qualifications were considered at least of some importance by a majority of the participants. Over 90% felt job experience, academic record and English were very important or of some importance.
2. Personal contacts were less often considered an important qualification, although over three-fifths felt personal contacts were at least of some importance.

Participants also were asked upon arrival in this country to rate the importance of certain benefits they expected from their educational experiences in the U.S. Table III-14 presents their replies on a three-part scale.

TABLE III-14

PARTICIPANTS' RATINGS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF CERTAIN BENEFITS EXPECTED FROM EDUCATION IN THE U.S.

	Very Important		Some Importance		Not Important		Total		Not Available
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
a. Advance my career interest	560	68.4	233	28.4	26	3.2	819	100.0	185
b. Prepare me for work important to the development of my country	831	95.6	36	4.2	2	0.2	869	100.0	135
c. Help me as a person through a broad educational experience	515	64.5	256	32.0	28	3.5	799	100.0	205

Comments:

1. More than 95% of the participants rated preparation to help in the development of their countries as the most important benefit of their educational experience in the U.S.
2. About two-thirds of the participants judged as very important the benefits of advancing their career interests (68.4%) and helping themselves as persons (64.5%).

Summary.

The picture that emerges from this background data is one of a very heterogeneous group of students. They are diverse in geographic origin, in age, and in occupation. Their objectives vary widely. Although they resemble foreign students in general in some respects, they differ significantly on geographic and field of study comparisons. Caution should be exercised in generalizing the findings of this Study to other groups.

Even given the diversity of this group, certain patterns can be ascertained. AID participants appear to be older than students in general, have been typically engaged in a professional position since last in school, and believed their job experience to be the most important reason they were asked to apply for the training program. These are not typical foreign students recently out of school who seek to study abroad and whose academic background is the major criterion for selection. Rather, AID participants are more mature, more established occupationally, more likely to study for teaching and other public service positions, and clearly see their programs as related to the development of their country. Although the quality of participants' academic records may not have been a major factor in their selection, the participants seem to have other important strengths such as maturity and motivation.

CHAPTER IV

ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS AT TIME OF ARRIVAL

This chapter presents data regarding the extent to which AID participants are qualified to pursue academic programs at U.S. colleges and universities. Such data are organized around two types of academic qualifications:

1. Previous educational background and achievement.
2. Scholastic aptitude as measured by standardized tests.

A third important type of academic qualification, command of the English language, will be discussed in Chapter VI.

Previous Educational Background and Achievement

Type of Secondary School Attended.

Table IV-1 presents information collected from the credential analysts concerning the type of secondary school attended by the 438 undergraduate AID participants.

TABLE IV-1

TYPE OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ATTENDED BY UNDERGRADUATES

	N	%
General (Academic)	259	71.5
Vocational	78	21.5
Teacher Training	25	7.0
Total...	362	100.0
Not available	76	
	438	

Comment. A significant majority of undergraduate participants attended a secondary school designed primarily to prepare them for an academic higher education in their home country. It is interesting to note that over one-fourth were prepared in secondary schools which do not usually prepare students for an academic higher education in the home country.

Years of Elementary and Secondary Training.

Table IV-2 gives the number of years of precollege work completed by the undergraduate participants as reported by the credential analysts.

TABLE IV-2

YEARS OF ELEMENTARY/SECONDARY TRAINING

	N	%
10 years or less	26	7.3
11 years	35	9.9
12 years	257	72.6
13 years	25	7.1
14 years	7	2.0
15 years	4	1.1
Total...	354	100.0
Not available	84	
	438	

Comments:

1. The median number of years of precollege work is 12.
2. About 17% of the group spent less than the "normal" (in U.S. terms) length of time in elementary/secondary work.

Admissibility of Participants to Higher Education in Their Home Countries.

The extent to which AID participants are eligible to compete for admission to universities in their home countries is another indication of their overall academic qualifications. The credential analyst was asked to provide an assessment of admissibility for each undergraduate participant. The responses are summarized in Table IV-3.

TABLE IV-3

ADMISSIBILITY TO UNIVERSITY IN THE PARTICIPANT'S HOME COUNTRY

	N	%
Eligible to compete for admission	312	81.5
Not eligible to compete for admission	71	18.5
Total...	383	100.0
Could not be established	55	
	438	

Comments:

1. A significant majority of the undergraduate participants would be eligible to compete for admission to a university in their home country.
2. The percentage who were judged to be eligible to compete for admission corresponds quite closely to the percentage who attended a college-preparatory secondary school.
3. While nearly one-fifth of the participants were rated as not eligible to compete for admission, it should be borne in mind that one of the characteristics of the U.S. system of higher education is its unusual diversity and capacity for accommodating students with a very wide range of academic aptitudes and backgrounds. Such flexibility is not characteristic of many countries from which participants come, which may account for this rather high percentage who are not eligible to compete for admission in their home countries.

Table IV-4 presents, for ten countries, the credential analysts' assessments of whether the undergraduate participants would be eligible to compete for admission in a home country university. The ten countries included in the table are those for which the largest number of credential analyst responses were available.

TABLE IV-4

ADMISSIBILITY TO UNIVERSITY IN THE PARTICIPANT'S HOME COUNTRY: BY COUNTRY

Country	Eligible to Compete for Admission		Not Eligible to Compete for Admission	
	N	%	N	%
Tunisia	14	100.0	0	0.0
Pakistan	5	100.0	0	0.0
Vietnam	207	96.7	7	3.3
Kenya	12	66.7	6	33.3
Malawi	5	63.0	3	37.0
Uganda	8	50.0	8	50.0
Zambia	13	46.4	15	53.6
Brazil	3	42.9	4	57.1
Somali Republic	2	33.3	4	66.7
Ethiopia	9	32.0	19	68.0

Comment. There is wide variation among countries in the extent to which AID participants would be eligible to compete for admission in a home-country university. While in some of the countries almost all of the participants appear to be eligible, in others as many as two-thirds are not eligible to compete for admission. However, it should be emphasized that in some countries there are limited opportunities for higher education in certain fields, which may have caused the credential analysts to rate the participants as "not eligible to compete for admission."

Highest Degree Earned.

Table IV-5 summarizes information on the highest degree earned by the participants as reported by the credential analysts. This information represents another index of the academic qualifications of the participants.

TABLE IV-5

HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED

	N	%
Doctorate	1	0.1
Master's	41	4.1
Bachelor's	454	45.2
Other degree	21	2.1
Some post-secondary work, but no degree	148	14.7
No post-secondary work	339	33.8
Total..	1004	100.0

Comments:

1. Slightly more than one-half of the participants had completed at least one degree prior to beginning their academic work in the U.S.
2. One-third of the group had completed no previous college work.

Appropriateness of Previous Academic Work.

Table IV-6 reports the judgments of the credential analysts, the AID Academic Advisory Staff, and the campus representatives as to the appropriateness of the participants' previous academic work for their studies in the U.S.

TABLE IV-6

APPROPRIATENESS OF PREVIOUS COURSE WORK

	Credential Analysts		AID Academic Advisory Staff		Campus Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Appropriate	607	65.8	687	74.5	619	67.1
Somewhat appropriate	283	30.7	215	23.4	258	28.0
Inappropriate	32	3.5	20	2.1	45	4.9
Total...	922	100.0	922	100.0	922	100.0
Not available	82		82		82*	
	1004		1004		1004	

---

*For 30 of these cases no CPQ was received from the campus representative. (These 82 participants are not the same 82 for whom no data are available from the credential analysts and AAS.)

Comment. All three of the sets of ratings agree that the previous course work of over 95% of the participants was at least somewhat appropriate for their prescribed academic program of study in the U.S.

Quality of Previous Academic Work.

Table IV-7 summarizes the quality of the participants' previous academic work as rated by the credential analysts, the AID Academic Advisory Staff, and the campus representatives. The credential analysts and AAS ratings were made relative to other students within each home country whereas the campus representatives' ratings are relative to their own institutional standards.

TABLE IV-7

QUALITY OF PREVIOUS ACADEMIC RECORD

	Credential Analysts		AID Academic Advisory Staff		Campus Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Superior	76	8.3	99	10.9	33	3.7
Above Average	427	46.7	459	50.1	258	28.8
Average	328	35.9	293	32.2	447	49.9
Marginal	73	8.0	59	6.4	129	14.4
Inadequate	10	1.1	4	.4	29	3.2
Total...	914	100.0	914	100.0	896	100.0
Not available	90		90		108*	
	1004		1004		1004	

---

*No CPQ received for 30 of these cases.

Comments:

1. The previous academic records of more than 90% of the participants are rated average or above by the credential analysts and the Academic Advisory Staff, while 82% of the participants' records are so rated by the campus representatives.
2. A much smaller percentage of the participants' records are rated above average or superior by the campus representative (33%) than by either the credential analysts (55%) or AAS (61%).
3. Eighteen percent of the participants' records are judged to be marginal or inadequate by the campus representatives, which is a substantially higher percentage than so rated by either the credential analysts or Academic Advisory Staff.

Rank in Class.

Each participant was asked to estimate his class rank in his most recent academic work. The rankings are reported in Table IV-8.

TABLE IV-8

ESTIMATED RANK IN CLASS

Class Rank	Undergraduate		Graduate		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Upper 10%	133	45.4	199	45.1	332	45.2
Upper 25%	89	30.3	151	34.3	240	32.8
Upper 50%	67	22.9	86	19.5	153	20.8
Lower 50%	4	1.4	5	1.1	9	1.2
Total...	293	100.0	441	100.0	734	100.0
Cannot estimate	42		87		129	
Did not estimate	103		38		141	
	438		566		1004	

Comments:

1. Virtually all of the participants estimated that they ranked in the top half of their class.
2. Over three-fourths of both the undergraduate and graduate participants reported their rank to be in the upper 25% of the class.

Type of U.S. Institution for Which Participants Are Qualified.

The credential analysts and the AID Academic Advisory Staff indicated for each participant the type of U.S. college or university in which they believed he could do satisfactory academic work in terms of the academic competition on the campus. Table IV-9 presents these professional opinions on a scale of competitiveness.

TABLE IV-9

TYPE OF U.S. INSTITUTION IN WHICH PARTICIPANTS COULD DO SATISFACTORY WORK

Type of Institution	Credential Analyst		AID Academic Advisory Staff	
	N	%	N	%
Highly competitive	18	2.0	10	1.1
Competitive	277	30.2	248	27.0
Average	498	54.3	541	59.1
Not competitive	104	11.3	92	10.0
No institution appropriate	20	2.2	26	2.8
Total...	917	100.0	917	100.0
Could not be established	87		87	
	1004		1004	

Comments:

1. Nearly one-third of the participants are rated as likely to perform satisfactorily in a competitive or highly competitive U.S. university or college.
2. Over half are rated as likely to find a U.S. institution of average competition most appropriate.
3. Less than 3% are rated as unlikely to do satisfactory work in any U.S. university or college.

Scholastic Aptitude as Measured by Standardized Tests

Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) Results for Undergraduate Participants.

The College Board Scholastic Aptitude Test was administered to 350 of the 438 undergraduates upon their arrival in the U.S. The SAT Verbal score distribution for these participants is given in Table IV-10. (SAT scores range from 200-800. The mean SAT Verbal score of college-bound U.S. high school seniors in 1969-1970 was 458.)

TABLE IV-10

SAT VERBAL SCORE DISTRIBUTION

	N	%
550 and above	1	0.3
500-549	6	1.7
450-499	1	0.3
400-449	12	3.5
350-399	45	12.8
300-349	99	28.3
250-299	97	27.7
200-249	89	25.4
Total...	350	100.0
Not available	88	
	438	

Mean: 297

Standard Deviation:[1] 64

Comments:

1. Less than 3% of the AID undergraduate participants earn SAT Verbal scores which are above the average college-bound U.S. high school seniors.
2. The average undergraduate participant's verbal score of 297 ranks at the 8th percentile of college-bound U.S. high school seniors.
3. The low verbal scores are likely to be caused, at least in part, by such factors as the participants' cultural and background differences, lack of test-taking experience, and weaknesses in working rapidly with English language material and in other aspects of English proficiency.

---

[1] "Standard Deviation" (S.D.) is an index of variability which utilizes in its calculation the difference (d) of each score from the average score [$S.D. = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma d^2}{N}}$, where "$\Sigma$" (Sigma) means "the sum of"].

Table IV-11 presents the distribution for the SAT Mathematics scores earned by 348 of the undergraduates. (The mean SAT Mathematics score of college-bound U.S. high school seniors in 1969-1970 was 484.)

TABLE IV-11

SAT MATHEMATICS SCORE DISTRIBUTION

	N	%
750 and above	1	0.3
700-749	1	0.3
650-699	6	1.7
600-649	17	4.9
550-599	14	4.0
500-549	39	11.2
450-499	48	13.8
400-449	78	22.4
350-399	70	20.1
300-349	54	15.5
250-299	19	5.5
200-249	1	0.3
Total...	348	100.0
Not available	90	
	438	

Mean: 433

Standard Deviation: 98

Comments:

1. About one-fourth of the AID undergraduate participants earn SAT Mathematics scores which are above the average of college-bound U.S. high school seniors.

2. The average undergraduate participant's mathematical score of 433 ranks at the 36th percentile of college-bound U.S. high school seniors.
3. The mean SAT Mathematics score is significantly higher than the mean SAT Verbal score as would be likely because of much less emphasis on cultural and English proficiency factors in the mathematics test.

Graduate Record Examination (GRE) Aptitude Test Results for Graduate Participants.

Table IV-12 presents the distribution of scores on the Verbal section of the GRE which was administered to 520 of the 566 graduate participants. (The score scale for the GRE ranges from 200 to 800. The mean GRE Verbal score of U.S. graduate school applicants and students in 1965-1968 was 520.)

TABLE IV-12

GRE VERBAL SCORE DISTRIBUTION

	N	%
600 and above	1	0.2
550-599	1	0.2
500-549	4	0.8
450-499	14	2.7
400-449	19	3.7
350-399	44	8.5
300-349	96	18.4
250-299	146	28.0
200-249	195	37.5
Total...	520	100.0
Not available	46	
	566	

Mean: 282

Standard Deviation: 71

Comments:

1. About 1% of the AID graduate participants earn GRE Verbal scores which are above the average of U.S. graduate applicants and students.
2. The average graduate participant's Verbal score of 282 ranks at the 2nd percentile of U.S. graduate applicants and students.
3. The participants' cultural and experiential differences, lack of test-taking experience and weaknesses in English language proficiency are factors which are likely to have caused, in part, the low Verbal scores.

Table IV-13 shows the distribution of GRE Quantitative scores. (The mean GRE Quantitative score of U.S. graduate school applicants and students in 1965-1968 was 528.)

TABLE IV-13

GRE QUANTITATIVE SCORE DISTRIBUTION

	N	%
750 and above	7	1.4
700-749	9	1.7
650-699	17	3.3
600-649	19	3.7
550-599	27	5.2
500-549	68	13.1
450-499	71	13.7
400-449	86	16.6
350-399	87	16.8
300-349	74	14.3
250-299	53	10.2
200-249	0	0.0
Total...	518	100.0
Not available	48	
	566	

Mean: 437

Standard Deviation: 116

Comments:

1. About one-fifth of the AID graduate participants earn GRE Quantitative scores which are above the average of U.S. graduate applicants and students.
2. The average graduate participant's mathematical score of 437 ranks at the 26th percentile of U.S. graduate applicants and students.
3. The mean GRE Quantitative score is significantly higher than the mean GRE Verbal score, as was true in the case of the SAT. Undoubtedly, as with the SAT, English language barriers and cultural emphases on the Verbal test partially account for the lower verbal scores. There is a more even distribution of mathematical scores than of verbal scores on the GRE.

Table IV-14 shows a comparison of GRE Aptitude Test scores earned by the participants with the scores of one sample of other foreign students who were studied several years ago. These data are the best available for comparative purposes.

TABLE IV-14

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF GRE SCORES OF GRADUATE-LEVEL PARTICIPANTS COMPARED WITH A SAMPLE OF OTHER FOREIGN STUDENTS

	AID Participants		Other Foreign Students[1]	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
GRE Verbal	282	71	373	105
GRE Quantitative	437	116	531	126

Comment. Graduate-level AID participants earn scores on the GRE Aptitude Test which are significantly lower than those of this sample[1] of other foreign graduate students. Caution should be used in attempting to generalize on the basis of this comparison about GRE score differences between AID participants and the total population of other foreign students in the U.S. due to the limited nature of the reference sample.

---

[1] Means and standard deviations as reported in Graduate Record Examinations Special Report, "The Performance of Foreign Graduate Students on the Graduate Record Examinations Aptitude Test," Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, September 1961, p. 5. This study was based on a sample of 637 foreign students enrolled at the following four U.S. institutions: Florida State University, the University of Florida, the University of Illinois, and the University of Texas. An attempt was made to include only students "from countries where English is not the principal language spoken." The data were collected during the academic year 1960-1961. No information concerning the educational experiences of these students either before or after the GRE testing was collected, which leaves unanswered any questions regarding their comparability with AID participants.

Summary and Conclusions.

The AID participants appear to be a generally well-qualified group of students. They tend to have had approximately the same number of years of educational preparation as domestic students. A large majority of undergraduates would be eligible for admission to institutions in their home country. Over half of the participants have earned some type of degree before coming to the U.S.

The previous academic work of almost all of the participants is relevant for their training objective in the U.S. Almost all of the participants reported that they ranked in the top half of the class in their most recent home-country academic work. The credential analysts and AAS rate the quality of such previous work as above average or superior for over half of the participants. All of the raters agreed that over 80% of the participants' previous academic records were of at least average quality as compared with those of other foreign students. Only a very few participants were judged to have performed inadequately in their previous academic work. Over 80% of the participants are rated as capable of doing satisfactory work in a U.S. university or college of average competition.

The Scholastic Aptitude Test scores of AID undergraduate participants are considerably lower than those of college-bound U.S. high school seniors. Similarly, the GRE scores of the graduate participants are lower than those of U.S. graduate students. The mathematical scores on the SAT and GRE are significantly higher than the verbal scores for undergraduates and graduates, respectively, which is probably a result of the fact that these mathematics tests are less dependent on English proficiency and cultural background.

On each of the indices of academic qualifications there is a small proportion of participants about whom one can raise serious questions as to their readiness for academic study in the U.S. In the case of the undergraduates, a small minority attended nonacademic secondary schools, have spent less than the normal time in precollege work and would probably not be admissible in home-country institutions. A small proportion of both the undergraduate and graduate participants have performed marginally in their previous academic work, report their most recent class rank to be in the bottom 50% and could not be expected to compete successfully in any U.S. university or college. However, it does seem reasonable to conclude that there are almost no AID participants whose backgrounds and qualifications appear to be inappropriate for academic study in any type of U.S. university or college. Further evidence on this tentative conclusion will emerge in Chapter VII which summarizes findings on how well participants actually do perform academically in U.S. institutions.

CHAPTER V
PLACEMENT OF PARTICIPANTS

Chapter V presents the information gathered in this Study related to the placement of 1004 academic participants. The chapter consists of two parts. The first part presents comparison of participants' expectations with plans stated for them in their PIO/P's and outcomes reported by campus representatives. These comparisons deal with:

a. Fields of study.

b. Starting levels.

c. Degree objectives.

The second part presents information on the admission and placement processes. Topics covered include:

a. Completeness of credentials.

b. Admission and placement actions.

c. Placement recommendations.

Conclusions are presented at the end of the chapter.

A Comparison of AID Training Objectives With Participants' Expectations and Campus Outcomes

This Study collected information on (1) the field of study which each participant upon arrival in the U.S. indicated he expected to study, and (2) the training "major" which his PIO/P indicated he was programmed to follow.

Table V-1 summarizes the numbers of participants who said they expected to pursue various "fields of study."

TABLE V-1

FIELDS OF STUDY PARTICIPANTS EXPECTED TO STUDY IN THE U.S.

Field of Study	N	%
1. Agriculture	137	15.8
2. Biological science	28	3.2
3. Business and commerce	90	10.4
4. Education	201	23.2
5. Engineering	138	15.9
6. Health professions	54	6.2
7. Home economics	9	1.1
8. Humanities, e.g., communications, journalism, radio, etc.	19	2.2
9. Physical sciences	38	4.4
10. Social sciences	152	17.6
Total...	866	100.0
Not answered	138	
Total...	1004	

Comment. The five fields of study reported by most participants, ranked in descending order, are: education (23.2%), social sciences (17.6%), engineering (15.9%), agriculture (15.8%), and business and commerce (10.4%).

Comparison of Expected Fields of Study and PIO/P Majors. Table V-2 which follows presents a cross-comparison of the "fields of study expected by the participants," (as given in Table V-1) with the "majors" prescribed for them in their PIO/P's. The fields of study expected by the participants are listed down the left margin of the table; the majors planned for them extend from left to right along the top of the table.

TABLE V-2

COMPARISON OF FIELDS OF STUDY EXPECTED BY PARTICIPANTS WITH THE MAJORS SCHEDULED FOR THEM ON THEIR PIO/P's

Major Scheduled in PIO/P Field Expected by Participant	Agric.	Biol. Sci.	Bus. & Com.	Educ.	Engin.	Health Prof.	Home Econ.	Humanities	Phys. Sci.	Soc. Sci.	Total N	Total %
Agriculture	98	7	4	14	4	1	1	0	2	6	137	15.8
Biological Science	1	19	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	28	3.2
Business and Commerce	4	1	48	10	6	0	0	1	0	20	90	10.3
Education	2	0	3	159	4	8	2	6	3	14	201	23.3
Engineering	13	3	4	26	68	2	1	0	15	6	138	16.0
Health Professions	2	3	2	2	2	36	1	0	0	6	54	6.2
Home Economics	1	0	0	5	0	0	2	0	0	1	9	1.0
Humanities	0	0	2	7	2	2	0	3	1	2	19	2.2
Physical Sciences	0	0	3	15	1	1	1	0	17	0	38	4.4
Social Sciences	6	0	7	19	2	3	0	0	2	113	152	17.6
Total....	127	33	75	261	91	53	8	10	40	168	866	
Percent..	14.7	3.8	8.6	30.2	10.5	6.1	0.9	1.2	4.6	19.4		100.0

Comment. There are substantial differences among the "fields expected" and the "majors scheduled." By adding the field-major numbers along the diagonal from upper left to lower right, we find that a total of only 562, or 65%, of the participants expected the same fields of study as the majors planned for them in their PIO/P's. The majors planned for the other 35% deviated from their expected fields of study. Some of these discrepancies may be due mainly to differences in interpretations of fields and majors. They may also be due to communication difficulties between AID and the participants.

Table V-3 summarizes the major fields of study followed by 949 participants in U.S. universities and colleges as reported by AACRAO-AID campus representatives.

TABLE V-3

MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY FOLLOWED BY PARTICIPANTS IN U.S. UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

	Undergraduate		Graduate		Total	
Major Field of Study	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Agriculture	48	12.1	95	17.2	143	15.1
2. Biological science	4	1.0	22	4.0	26	2.7
3. Business and commerce	32	8.1	75	13.6	107	11.3
4. Education	113	28.5	125	22.6	238	25.1
5. Engineering	121	30.4	38	6.9	159	16.8
6. Health professions	15	3.8	42	7.7	57	6.0
7. Home economics	5	1.3	0	0.0	5	0.5
8. Humanities	10	2.5	15	2.7	25	2.6
9. Physical sciences	22	5.5	30	5.4	52	5.5
10. Social sciences	27	6.8	110	19.9	137	14.4
Total...	397	100.0	552	100.0	949	100.0
Not available	37		18		55	
Total...	434		570		1004	

Comments:

1. Participants are widely distributed across major fields of study.
2. The five fields of study followed most frequently, ranked in descending order, are education (25.1%), engineering (16.8%), agriculture (15.1%), social science (14.4%), and business and commerce (11.3%).
3. The distribution of undergraduate and graduate participants among the ten fields and majors of training is generally quite similar, except in engineering where four-fifths (121 of 159) are undergraduate participants.

TABLE V-4

COMPARISON OF EDUCATIONAL MAJORS PRESCRIBED FOR PARTICIPANTS IN THEIR TRAINING PROGRAMS (PIO/P's) WITH THE MAJOR FIELDS OF STUDY THEY FOLLOWED IN U.S. UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

Major on Campus / Major Planned in PIO/P	Agric.	Biol. Sci.	Bus. & Com.	Educ.	Engin.	Health Prof.	Home Econ.	Humanities	Phys. Sci.	Soc. Sci.	Total N	Total %
Agriculture	95	1	6	4	11	1	1	0	1	3	123	12.9
Biological Science	7	14	[illegible]	2	5	7	0	0	1	0	37	3.9
Business and Commerce	5	2	45	7	4	1	0	2	3	10	79	8.3
Education	12	3	11	194	18	1	4	6	15	10	274	28.9
Engineering	8	1	5	4	93	3	0	3	5	3	125	13.2
Health Professions	2	2	0	6	2	40	0	3	1	0	56	5.9
Home Economics	1	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	0.8
Humanities	1	0	1	5	0	0	0	6	0	1	14	1.5
Physical Sciences	4	1	2	3	17	0	0	1	25	1	54	5.7
Social Sciences	8	0	36	10	8	4	0	4	0	109	179	18.9
Total--N	143	26	107	238	159	57	5	25	52	137	949	
%	15.1	2.7	11.3	25.1	16.8	6.0	0.5	2.6	5.5	14.4		100.0

Comment. The sum of the numbers along the diagonal from upper left to lower right is 621. This shows that the majors of participants reported by campus representatives were the same as prescribed for them in their PIO/P's in 65.4% of the cases. The other 328 participants appear to be studying fields which, at least in title, are different from those given in their PIO/P's. One reason for the considerable difference is the great variety and overlapping of curricular descriptions at U.S. institutions. Another may be genuine misunderstanding in interpreting training objectives.

Starting Levels of Participants. Participants were asked at what educational level they considered themselves qualified to begin their studies. Credential analysts in Washington also made judgments concerning the levels at which the participants should be placed in our universities. Table V-5 presents a comparison of these judgments by participants and credential analysts.

TABLE V-5

COMPARISON OF EDUCATIONAL STARTING LEVELS OF PARTICIPANTS AS JUDGED BY THE PARTICIPANTS AND BY CREDENTIAL ANALYSTS

Credential Analysts / Participants	Pre-University	Undergraduate				Graduate			Not Qualified	Total	
		1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year	Master With Defic.	Master No Defic.	Doctor		N	%
Undergraduate											
First Year	16	92	12		3	0	11	6	0	140	18.7
Second Year	2	21	6		2	0	3	6	0	40	5.4
Third Year	3	30	17	*	3	0	5	3	1	62	8.3
Fourth Year	0	6	2		2	1	2	1	0	14	1.9
Graduate											
Master's with deficiencies	2	22	13		18	20	86	71	5	237	31.8
Master's without deficiencies	2	10	6		6	11	102	80	4	221	29.6
Doctor's	0	0	0		1	3	8	12	8	32	4.3
Total--N	25	181	56		35	35	217	179	18	746	
%	3.4	24.4	7.5		4.7	4.7	29.0	23.9	2.4		100.0

---

*Data for comparing third-year levels are not available due to differences in coding procedures planned for credential analysts and participants.

Comments:

1. The sum of numbers along the diagonal from upper left to lower right shows that the participants and the credential analysts agreed on placement levels in 234 (31.3%) of the cases.
2. In 499 (66.1%) of the cases, the participants and the credential analysts differed by not more than one category.
3. In 295, or 39.5% of the cases, the analysts placed the participants higher than the participants did.
4. In 199, or 26.7% of the cases, the participants placed themselves higher than the credential analysts did.
5. Interpretations should take into account the possible misunderstandings of some of the questions by the participants. There are sufficient significant differences between the participants' expectations of placement and the credential analysts' recommendations to cause concern.

Table V-6 is a comparison of (1) the educational starting levels of 843 participants as judged by credential analysts and (2) the actual levels reported by campus representatives. The table permits a comparison of the extent to which these two sets of data are similar.

TABLE V-6

COMPARISON OF EDUCATIONAL STARTING LEVELS OF PARTICIPANTS AS JUDGED BY CREDENTIAL ANALYSTS AND THE ACTUAL LEVELS REPORTED BY CAMPUS REPRESENTATIVES

Campus Representatives / Credential Analysts	Pre-University	Undergraduate				Graduate			Unspecified	Total	
		1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year	Master With Defic.	Master No Defic.	Doctor		N	%
Pre-University	0	8	1	1	0	1	1	0	13	25	3.0
Undergraduate											
First year	1	174	19	8	1	6	9	0	33	251	29.8
Second year	0	27	8	9	8	8	5	0	9	74	8.8
*											
Fourth year	0	3	2	4	3	10	6	0	9	37	4.4
Graduate											
Master's with deficiencies	0	1	0	1	6	6	6	1	13	34	4.0
Master's without deficiencies	0	10	3	1	13	52	95	5	54	233	27.6
Doctor's	0	9	2	0	3	33	88	5	35	175	20.7
Not qualified	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	4	3	14	1.7
Total.....	1	233	35	24	35	116	215	15	169	843	
Percent...	0.1	27.6	4.2	2.8	4.2	13.8	25.5	1.8	20.0		100.0

*Data for comparing third-year levels are not available due to differences in coding procedures planned for credential analysts and campus representatives.

Comment. Exclusive of the "not qualified" and "unspecified" participants, there are 291 (44.0%) of the cases within the diagonal, which indicates that credential analysts and campus representatives agreed on the starting levels of those participants. Actual placements reported by the campus representatives were higher than the levels judged by the credential analysts in 113 (17.0%) of the cases and were lower in 258 (39.0%) of the cases.

Degree Objectives. Participants were asked what was the highest degree they expected to earn in their training programs. Credential analysts in Washington made judgments concerning the degree objective called for in the PIO/P. Table V-7 presents a comparison of the participant's expectation with the degree objective stated in the PIO/P's.

TABLE V-7

PARTICIPANTS' DEGREE OBJECTIVES STATED IN THEIR PIO/P's
COMPARED WITH THE HIGHEST DEGREES THEY EXPECTED TO EARN

Degree Objective / Highest Degree Expected	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctor's	Other	None	Total N	Total %
Bachelor's	85	17	1	3	16	122	14.3
Master's	87	302	5	1	84	479	56.2
Doctor's	21	72	27	0	12	132	15.5
Other	3	0	0	1	18	22	2.6
None	8	4	1	0	84	97	11.4
Total...	204	395	34	5	214	852	100.0

Summary. The data in Table V-7 may be summarized as follows:

	N	%
Degree objective corresponds with the degree expected (numbers along the diagonal line)	499	58.6
Degree objective is higher than degree expected	23	2.7
Degree objective is lower than degree expected	180	21.1
Agreement cannot be determined	150	17.6
	852	100.0

Comments:

1. Participants expected to earn a degree higher than that called for in their training program in over one-fifth of the cases (21.1%). By comparison less than 3% of the participants expected to earn a degree lower than that called for in their PIO/P.
2. These differences between the degree expectations of the participants and the degrees planned for them in their PIO/P's may be real differences, or they may be due to misunderstandings of terminology and the U.S. educational system. There also may be misunderstandings between the participants and AID regarding the participants' objectives.

Table V-8 presents a comparison of participants' degree objectives as judged by credential analysts in Washington and as reported by campus representatives.

TABLE V-8

COMPARISON OF DEGREE OBJECTIVES AS JUDGED BY CREDENTIAL ANALYSTS AND AS REPORTED BY CAMPUS REPRESENTATIVES

Credential Analysts \ Campus Representatives	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctor's	Other	None	Total N	Total %
Bachelor's	212	21	1	7	26	267	28.1
Master's	66	326	9	3	38	442	46.4
Doctor's	2	9	20	0	2	33	3.5
Other	1	0	0	4	0	5	0.5
None	17	51	1	5	131	205	21.5
Total...	298	407	31	19	197	952	100.0

Summary. The data in Table V-8 may be summarized as follows:

	N	%
Degree objectives reported by campus representatives and credential analysts correspond (numbers along the diagonal line)	693	72.8
Campus representatives reported higher degree objectives than credential analysts	31	3.2
Campus representatives reported lower degree objectives than credential analysts	77	8.1
Agreement cannot be determined	151	15.9
Total...	952	100.0

Comment. For almost three-fourths of the participants the campus representatives and the credential analysts in Washington agreed on their degree objectives. While they disagreed on 11.3% (3.2% plus 8.1%) of the participants, these do not necessarily imply changed degree objectives. These differences may be due at least partially to semantics or lack of information. However, it might be beneficial to investigate further those cases where there may have been inappropriate changes in degree objectives.

Admission and Placement Processes

Teams of credential analysts furnished by AACRAO reviewed and evaluated the academic records of participants in this Study who were scheduled for academic training in U.S. universities and colleges. In addition, the knowledge and judgments of the Academic Advisory Staff (AAS) of the Office of International Training in Washington, D.C., were included in the findings and recommendations which were recorded on the Credential Analysts Worksheets (CAW). A summary of the information on the CAW was forwarded to the Development Training Specialist. Beginning in May, 1969* the CAW report was prepared in four copies, and one of those copies was included in each participant's dossier when it was sent by the Development Training Specialist, or the Training Officer in a participating agency, to a university or college for an admission and placement decision.

Completeness of Academic Credentials. One of the major functions of the credential analysts in AAS is to decide if the credentials are sufficiently complete for the evaluation process, both in Washington and on a campus.

---

*This is an important date for it comes after the end of the period during which the sample was taken. A new OIT policy beginning on this date with reference to the use of the CAW has affected the placement procedure and result.

Table V-9 summarizes the completeness of 1004 participants' educational credentials and documents necessary for admission and placement in U.S. universities and colleges as judged by AACRAO credential analysts in Washington.

TABLE V-9

COMPLETENESS OF PARTICIPANTS' EDUCATIONAL CREDENTIALS AND DOCUMENTS AS JUDGED BY ANALYSTS IN WASHINGTON

Credential Completeness	N	%
Complete for evaluation	673	67.0
Incomplete, but sufficient for preliminary evaluation*	246	24.5
Incomplete; cannot evaluate	84	8.4
Not available	1	0.1
Total...	1004	100.0

---

*Missing credentials were requested and subsequently received.

Comments:

1. Two-thirds (67%) of the dossiers were judged complete for purposes of academic evaluation. An additional one-fourth were sufficiently complete for preliminary evaluation and forwarding to campuses for initial consideration.
2. Apparently there is need for a clearer understanding by Missions of what documentation should accompany the dossiers. Academic documentation should include three sets of complete official transcripts (including English translation, if applicable) of prior academic study, beginning with secondary level for undergraduates and with postsecondary level for graduates. The transcripts should include all courses completed, dates of completion, grades earned, and certification of any terminal awards. The latter should be in indigenous terms. Mark sheets should be included when appropriate. Any Mission recommendation or comment regarding academic records, job performance, or English language capability should also be submitted.
3. In view of the above information, it is recommended that existing AID Manual Orders be reviewed.

A further analysis of the analysts' responses showed that of the 45 countries from which the participants came, 38 of the countries submitted participant dossiers which were lacking essential credentials. Table V-10 below lists the 18 countries which had ten or more participants and shows the extent to which there were incomplete dossiers during the period of the Study. These countries are listed in descending order of percentage of participants whose credentials were incomplete.

TABLE V-10

SELECTED COUNTRIES WHOSE PARTICIPANTS' DOSSIERS LACKED SOME ADMISSIONS CREDENTIALS

Rank	Country	Number of Participants	Credentials Incomplete N	Credentials Incomplete %
1	Zambia	39	35	89.7
2	India	10	9	90.0
3	Malawi	22	17	77.3
4	Liberia	10	7	70.0
5	Tunisia	17	10	58.8
6	Pakistan	32	15	46.9
7	Argentina	13	6	46.2
8	Kenya	22	9	40.9
9	Nepal	15	6	40.0
10	Turkey	43	14	32.6
11	Brazil	72	22	30.6
12	Uganda	21	6	28.6
13	Vietnam	299	73	24.4
14	Indonesia	52	11	21.2
15	Ethiopia	83	17	20.5
16	Chile	18	3	16.7
17	Thailand	103	16	15.5
18	Korea	22	3	13.6
	Total...	893	279	31.2

Comments:

1. Nearly one-third (31.2%) of the participant dossiers received from these 18 countries lacked important admissions credentials when they reached U.S. campuses.
2. The incompleteness of admissions credentials ranged from 89.7% for Zambia to 13.6% for Korea, which suggests that this problem should be approached on an individual country basis.

Completeness of Credentials on Campus. Admission and placement of new students in U.S. universities and colleges depends greatly on the availability of academic transcripts, documents, and test scores. College admissions officers normally expect all such credentials to be at hand when the admissions decisions and enrollment authorizations are made. Therefore, one valid criterion of the efficiency of the AID placement procedures is the extent to which each participant dossier includes the necessary academic credentials. Table V-11 summarizes the completeness of 934 participant dossiers and the types of credentials which were lacking for 215 participants, as reported by campus representatives.

TABLE V-11

COMPLETENESS OF PARTICIPANTS' ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS FOR ADMISSION TO U.S. UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

Status of Credentials		Undergraduate		Graduate		Total	
		N	%	N	%	+N	%
A. Credential completeness							
1. Complete		314	77.5	389	73.5	703	75.3
2. Incomplete		91	22.5	140	26.5	231	24.7
	Total...	405	100.0	529	100.0	934	100.0
3. Not available		33		37		70	
	Total...	438		566		1004	
B. Credentials lacking							
1. Transcripts only		18	21.2	23	17.7	41	19.1
2. Test scores only		19	22.4	30	23.1	49	22.8
3. Other items or combinations		48	56.4	77	59.2	125	58.1
	Total...	85	100.0	130	100.0	215	100.0
4. Not indicated		6		10		16	
	Total...	91		140		231	

Comment. Campuses reported nearly one-fourth (24.7%) of the participant dossiers lacked some credentials needed for the admissions processes. These deficiencies were about the same at both the undergraduate and graduate levels (22.5% and 26.5%).

Actions Taken on Missing Credentials. Table V-12 summarizes 185 alternative actions taken on the lacking credentials of participants as reported by admissions officers in U.S. universities and colleges. Table V-10 reported earlier indicates that a total of 231 participants lacked one or more admissions credentials.

TABLE V-12

ACTIONS TAKEN BY CAMPUS ADMISSIONS OFFICERS WHEN CREDENTIALS WERE LACKING

	Undergraduate		Graduate		Total	
Actions	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Delayed admission decision and requested missing information	4	6.2	5	4.2	9	4.9
2. Rejected the participant	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
3. Granted tentative admission and requested missing information	7	10.8	26	21.7	33	17.8
4. Granted admission on the basis of available information	12	18.4	22	18.3	34	18.4
5. Requested and received the credentials	33	50.7	54	45.0	87	47.0
6. Administered test(s) on campus	5	7.7	13	10.8	18	9.7
7. Admitted as an auditor	4	6.2	0	.0	4	2.2
Total...	65	100.0	120	100.0	185	100.0
8. Other	3		3		6	
Total...	68		123		191	

Comments:

1. In the 185 cases where admission credentials were lacking, campuses requested and received the necessary credentials for 87, or 47.0% of the participants.
2. In 34 (18.4%) of the 185 cases, admission was granted on the basis of available information.
3. In no case was a participant rejected because of incomplete credentials.

Admission and Placement Actions on Campus

It is highly important to the success of the AID academic training program that participants be admitted appropriately and placed in their instructional programs. The following three tables present information on types of admission granted, extent of formal placement testing, and transfer credits granted.

Table V-13 summarizes the types of admission granted to 963 participants by institutions in which they enrolled, as reported by the AACRAO campus representatives.

TABLE V-13

TYPES OF ADMISSION GRANTED BY U.S. UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

Type of Admission	Undergraduate		Graduate		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Regular (degree)	302	73.8	272	49.1	574	59.6
2. Regular with deficiencies	12	3.0	73	13.2	85	8.8
3. Nondegree	43	10.5	132	23.8	175	18.2
4. Other	52	12.7	77	13.9	129	13.4
Total	409	100.0	554	100.0	963	100.0
Not available	29		12		41	
Total	438		566		1004	

Comments:

1. Three-fifths (59.6%) of the participants were granted admission with regular degree status. Less than one-tenth were admitted with deficiencies.
2. Admission with deficiencies occurred at the graduate level more often (13.2%) than it did at the undergraduate level (3.0%).
3. Almost three-fourths (73.8%) of the undergraduates were granted regular admission, while only 49.1% of the graduate-level participants were granted regular admission. Again it should be remembered that about 20% of the participants were not seeking degrees.

Table V-14 summarizes the numbers of participants who were given formal placement tests by the U.S. institutions in which they enrolled.

TABLE V-14

PARTICIPANTS WHO WERE GIVEN FORMAL PLACEMENT TESTS BY THE U.S. INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH THEY ENROLLED

Placement Tests	Undergraduate		Graduate		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Given	142	37.6	111	21.9	253	28.6
2. Not given	236	62.4	396	78.1	632	71.4
Total	378	100.0	507	100.0	885	100.0
Not available	60		59		119	
Total	438		566		1004	

Comments:

1. More than one-fourth (28.6%) of the 885 participants on which reports were made were given formal placement tests by their U.S. institutions. The taking of placement tests by participants when they enter U.S. universities and colleges is an important part of the enrollment process.
2. More than one-third (37.6%) of the undergraduates were given placement examinations, while only 21.9% of the graduate participants were given placement examinations.
3. A review of comments received from campus representatives revealed that no single test predominated in the placement testing.
4. The fact that 71.4% of the 885 participants were not given placement tests suggests that the evaluation of academic records by professional credential analysts is still the major factor in the placement of these participants, and other foreign students, in U.S. universities and colleges.

Table V-15 summarizes the numbers of participants who were awarded transfer credits by their U.S. institutions.

TABLE V-15

PARTICIPANTS GRANTED TRANSFER CREDITS BY U.S. INSTITUTIONS

	Undergraduate		Graduate		Total	
Transfer Credits	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Given	219	53.4	25	4.6	244	25.7
2. Not given	191	46.6	516	95.4	707	74.3
Total	410	100.0	541	100.0	951	100.0
Not available	28		25		53	
Total	438		566		1004	

Comments:

1. Slightly more than half (53.4%) of the undergraduate participants were given transfer credits.
2. Only 4.6% of the graduate-level participants were given transfer credits. This is not surprising, since graduate schools do not usually grant transfer credits.

Institutional Placement--Recommended Versus Actual. This Study gathered data on (1) the recommendations made by the Missions and the AAS/W concerning institutions in which to place participants, and (2) the institutions in which the DTS actually placed the participants. Table V-16 shows the extent to which the recommendations of the Missions were followed by OIT and by participating agencies (PA) in Washington.

TABLE V-16

EXTENT TO WHICH MISSION PLACEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS WERE FOLLOWED

	Placed by OIT		Placed by PA		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mission recommendation followed	192	59.3	74	59.2	266	59.2
Mission recommendation not followed	132	40.7	51	40.8	183	40.8
Total...	324	100.0	125	100.0	449	100.0
Mission made no recommendation					332	
Placed directly by Mission					62	
Not available					161	
Total...					1004	

Comments:

1. The Missions' recommendations coincided with the actual institutional placements of participants made by OIT and by participating agencies about three-fifths (59.2%) of the time.
2. For 332 participants the Missions made no recommendations concerning institutional placements.

The AAS/W also made recommendations concerning the institutional placements of participants. Table V-17 shows the extent to which those recommendations were followed by the DTS's and the participating agencies.

TABLE V-17

EXTENT TO WHICH AAS/W PLACEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS WERE FOLLOWED

	N	%
AAS recommendation followed	137	38.4
AAS recommendation not followed	220	61.6
Total...	357	100.0
Not applicable (Public Health, Agriculture, and special Vietnamese groups)	402	
Placed directly by Missions	62	
No AAS recommendation	183	
Total...	1004	

Comments:

1. The AAS/W made institutional placement recommendations for 35% of the participants in the sample.
2. The actual placements by the DTS's and participating agencies coincided with the AAS/W placement recommendations for 137 (38.4%) of this 35% of the participants in the sample.

Summary and Conclusions

The fields of study expected by most participants upon arrival in the U.S., ranked in descending order, were education, social sciences, engineering, agriculture, and business and commerce. However, the fields of study expected by participants agreed with their prescribed majors only 65% of the time. The major fields of study followed by participants in U.S. universities and colleges, ranked in descending order, were education, engineering, agriculture, social sciences, and business and commerce. The major fields of study followed by participants on campus agreed with their PIO/P plans only 65.5% of the time. This difference of 35% in the participants' expectations concerning their fields of study in the U.S. and the majors in their PIO/P's and on campuses should be studied to see if these differences are serious and what are their causes.

Participants also came with expectations regarding the educational levels at which they should start their training programs. Credential analysts agreed with them in only 31.3% of the cases, recommending that 39.5% of the participants be placed higher and 26.7% be placed lower. Credential analysts and campus representatives differed similarly regarding starting levels. Since the levels at which campuses start participants are the real ones, it is not unexpected that participants' expectations and credential analysts' recommendations may vary from the final outcomes. Perhaps these gaps can be reduced by improved communication and indoctrination.

Participants' expectations concerning the degrees they would earn agreed with their prescribed degree objectives in 58.6% of the cases. Otherwise they tend to have degree expectations higher than their training programs called for. Credential analysts and campus representatives agreed on degree objectives for 72.8% of the participants. The differences here may be due largely to semantics and to variations in institutional practices.

The discrepancies noted above between the participant's expectations and the actual training program which he was to pursue are substantial. Since both the First Annual Report (May 1969) and the Second Annual Report (July 1970), Participant Assessment of AID Training Programs, OIT/AID[1], stressed the importance of participants understanding and agreeing with the level and relevance of their training programs, these discrepancies should be cause for concern. It is recommended that greater efforts be made to fully inform participants concerning their training programs.

Many participants' dossiers lacked educational credentials essential for effective evaluation and placement. Credential analysts in Washington found only 67% of them complete for evaluation. Campus representatives reported only 75.3% of the dossiers contained complete academic credentials. During this Study campus admissions officers have been reasonably tolerant and flexible about the missing credentials and have permitted many participants to enroll while the credentials were procured. It is recommended that adequate guidelines to overcome this deficiency be prepared and administered regularly.

The types of admission granted participants by universities and colleges appear to be normal and appropriate. Allowing for the one-fifth of them who were not seeking degrees, their admission status appears favorable. Only 3.0% of the undergraduates and 13.2% of the graduates were admitted to regular degree status with deficiencies. For foreign students this is a commendable situation.

Only 28.6% of the participants were given formal placement tests when they enrolled. Thus the proper evaluation of academic credentials is still the major base for the effective placement of participants in universities and colleges.

---

[1] Participant Assessment of AID Training Programs, Second Annual Report. Office of International Development, U.S. Department of State, Washington, D.C., 20523, July 1970, pp. 10-11.

Advanced standing transfer credits were granted to 53.4% of the undergraduates, but to only 4.6% of the graduates. This appears to be a normal situation.

Recommendations by the Missions, and by OIT/W, concerning the placement of particip[illegible] in U.S. universities and colleges, are an integral part of the AID system[illegible] Missions' recommendations coincided with the eventual placement in 60% of the cases. In those cases where AAS made a placement recommendation, the actual placement coincided in 40% of the cases. It appears that the system of institutional placement recommendations should be reviewed by AID to assess the significance of these findings.

CHAPTER VI
ENGLISH LANGUAGE

The English proficiency of foreign students is assumed to be of crucial importance in their preparation and subsequent performance. Many of AID's placement procedures relate to English proficiency and training and deserve special attention. The AID participants are examined in this chapter in terms of:

A. English background and competence
  1. Home country language background.
  2. Tested English proficiency prior to academic study.
  3. Interrelationship between ALI/GU and TOEFL scores.
  4. Call forward and placement by AID procedures.

B. Effects on performance
  1. Amount of additional English training required in the U.S.
  2. Relationship of English proficiency to performance.

English Background and Competence

1. Language Background. Participants were asked to report the language spoken in their home, the language of instruction in their secondary school and their university (if any), and their official country language (omissions of country language were completed by the Study staff).

The frequency of various official country languages is shown in Table VI-1.

TABLE VI-1

OFFICIAL COUNTRY LANGUAGE OF PARTICIPANTS

Language	N	%
Vietnamese	300	29.8
English	152	15.1
Thai	103	10.2
Amharic	81	8.1
Portuguese	72	7.2
Spanish	70	7.0
Indonesian	52	5.2
Turkish	43	4.3
Arabic	24	2.4
Korean	22	2.2
Others	85	8.5
	1004	100.0

This distribution, of course, parallels the distribution of participants by country but also shows that almost 85% of the participants came from non-English speaking countries. This table does not necessarily indicate the language most familiar to the participant however, as shown by Table VI-2 based on language spoken in the home, the secondary school, and the university.

TABLE VI-2

LANGUAGE SPOKEN IN HOME, SECONDARY SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY

Language	Percent in Home	Percent in Secondary School	Percent in University
Afro-Asiatic	3.7	0.0	0.0
Amharic	6.4	0.0	0.0
Arabic	2.7	1.4	0.1
English	1.6	26.6	29.4
English and other	0.7	5.4	7.2
French	0.8	7.1	6.6
Indo-European	2.9	1.6	0.0
Indonesian	3.5	4.4	3.9
Korean	2.3	1.9	2.4
Malayo-Polynesian	1.9	0.1	0.0
Niger-Congo	11.6	0.0	0.0
Portuguese	7.9	7.8	8.8
Spanish	7.2	7.3	8.1
Thai	11.4	10.5	10.2
Turkish	4.9	4.1	4.7
Vietnamese	22.4	17.2	16.8
Other	8.1	4.6	1.8
Total--%	100.0	100.0	100.0
N	885	886	762

Comments:

1. Less than 2% of the participants reported an English speaking home and a wide variety of dialects are reported.
2. In response to the language of instruction questions, 27% of the participants reported English as the instructional language in secondary school and 29% reported English as the instructional language in their university.
3. Overall, a large majority of the participants had little contact with English in these settings.

If English was not the language of instruction in school, the participant was asked to report the number of years of English study in school. Table VI-3 summarizes these data.

TABLE VI-3

YEARS OF ENGLISH STUDY IN SCHOOL WHERE ENGLISH IS NOT LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION

Years	N	%
0	5	0.8
1	29	4.7
2	56	9.0
3	69	11.0
4	44	7.1
5	39	6.3
6 - 10	258	41.4
11 - 15	80	12.8
16 or more	9	1.4
No answer	34	5.5
Total...	623	100.0

Comments:

1. Virtually all participants who were not in English speaking schools studied English as a regular school subject.
2. Over one-half of these participants studied English for at least six years.

2. English Proficiency. The English proficiency test scores used in this Study came from three sources.

a. ALI/GU tests administered overseas to determine readiness for academic or further English study.

1. English Language Usage.
2. Oral Rating.
3. Vocabulary-Reading.
4. Listening.

b. ALI/GU tests administered upon arrival in the U.S.*

1. English Language Usage.
2. Vocabulary-Reading.
3. Listening.

---

*The Oral Rating Form was not used in the U.S. as staff and time did not permit individual administration.

c. TOEFL test administered upon arrival in the U.S.

1. Listening Comprehension.
2. English Structure.
3. Vocabulary.
4. Reading Comprehension.
5. Writing Ability.
6. Total.

Table VI-4 shows the mean TOEFL scores of AID participants in this Study and the mean TOEFL scores of all foreign applicants tested from February 1964 to April 1967. While the most meaningful comparison in this context would be to compare the scores of these AID participants with the scores of all foreign students who enrolled in colleges in the United States, those scores are not available. However, average TOEFL scores for 34,774 foreign students who applied for admission to U.S. institutions are available.[1]

---

[1] Test of English as a Foreign Language, Interpretive Information. College Entrance Examination Board, New York, N.Y., and Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, revised January, 1968, p.6.

TABLE VI-4

MEAN* TOEFL SCORES FOR AID PARTICIPANTS AND FOR ALL FOREIGN APPLICANTS TESTED BETWEEN 1964 AND 1967

TOEFL Part Test	Mean Score for AID Participants	Mean Score for All Foreign Applicants
Listening Comprehension	50	49
English Structure	49	49
Vocabulary	48	48
Reading Comprehension	48	48
Writing Ability	47	48
Total (score)	483	484
	N =930**	34,774

---

*Mean is the arithmetic average.

**Does not include a group of Vietnamese participants who were not tested.

Comment. The English proficiency of AID participants is very similar to that of all foreign applicants. One could have expected the AID participants to have scored higher than the reference group of foreign applicants because the participants had already been selected for training in U.S. colleges and universities. Also, they had undergone some screening for English proficiency before they were brought to the U.S.

The participants' TOEFL scores may also be interpreted in terms of guidelines suggested by the Educational Testing Service (ETS), the publishers of TOEFL. Table VI-5 shows (1) the test-score levels which ETS suggests for interpreting TOEFL scores,[1] and (2) the distribution of scores for (a) the total group of 930 participants and (b) the campus group of 796 participants placed directly at colleges and universities (excluding participants who attended the American Language Institute at Georgetown University, but including some participants who pursued full-time English language programs on campus before beginning academic studies).

---

[1] Ibid., p. 24.

TABLE VI-5

DISTRIBUTION OF AID PARTICIPANTS ON TOEFL ACCORDING TO ETS GUIDELINES

		AID Participants			
		Total Group		Campus Group	
TOEFL Score	ETS Interpretation	N	%	N	%
550 and above	No restrictions.	173	18	170	21
450 - 549	Students appear to need some EFL* training. No restrictions in course load necessary.	463	50	424	53
300 - 449	Reduced study load. Considerable EFL is needed.	287	31	202	26
200 - 299	Student requires full-time intensive EFL instruction.	7	1	0	0
	Total...	930	100	796	100

---

*EFL=English as a foreign language.

Comment. Approximately two-thirds (68 percent) of all AID participants demonstrated adequate English proficiency on arrival to undertake full programs of college studies. Of those placed directly on a campus, roughly three-fourths (74 percent) appeared ready for a full academic program.

Participants were asked upon arrival if they felt their English proficiency was adequate for full-time academic study. Table VI-6 shows the TOEFL score distribution for participants answering "yes" and those answering "no."

TABLE VI-6

DISTRIBUTION OF TOEFL SCORES FOR PARTICIPANTS ACCORDING TO SELF-RATING ON ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

TOEFL Score	English Good Enough N	English Good Enough %	English Not Good Enough N	English Not Good Enough %
550+	133	21.1	5	2.1
450 - 549	335	53.0	73	30.2
300 - 449	163	25.7	144	59.5
200 - 299	1	0.2	20	8.2
Total...	632	100.0	242	100.0
Mean Score	482		401	

Comment. There is clearly a general tendency for participants to perceive their English proficiency accurately. Using a score of 450 to distinguish eligibility for full academic study, 74% of the "yes" group and 68% of the "no" group answered correctly. Using the 450 criterion, 28% of the total group had incorrect perceptions.

ALI/GU Scores.

The participants' ALI/GU test scores are analyzed in subsequent tables in terms of the AID "score thresholds" given below:

Test	Minimum AID Score Thresholds[1] For Immediate Campus Placement	Minimum AID Score Thresholds[1] For Further English Training in the U.S.
English Usage	80	65
Oral Interview	80	65
Vocabulary-Reading	65	50
Listening	65	50

---

[1] AID Manual Order, No. 1382.3, Attachment A, page A-2, Section VIII,B.

Participants who meet all four of the score thresholds in the first column above are classified as ready for placement in a program of college academic studies in the U.S. ("immediate Call-forward"). Participants who do not meet all four of those score thresholds but do meet the four thresholds in the second column are classified as ready for a program of further English study in the U.S. ("Call-forward to ALI/GU"). Participants who do not meet all four of the thresholds in the second column are classified as unqualified to come to the U.S.

The ALI/GU scores used for Call-forward are shown in Table VI-7 with horizontal lines indicating the two thresholds noted above.

TABLE VI-7

DISTRIBUTION OF OVERSEAS ALI/GU SCORES

Scores	Test							
	Usage		Oral		Voc/Rdg		List.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
95 - 100	83	14.1	12	2.5	12	2.3	77	14.1
90 - 94	115	19.4	32	6.7	25	4.7	56	10.2
85 - 89	110	18.6	60	12.6	48	9.1	79	14.4
80 - 84	77	13.0	147	30.8	54	10.2	74	13.5
75 - 79	63	10.7	85	17.9	79	15.0	67	12.2
70 - 74	51	8.6	45	9.5	79	15.0	54	9.8
65 - 69	14	2.4	20	4.2	63	11.9	35	6.4
60 - 64	21	3.6	31	6.5	43	8.1	19	3.5
55 - 59	13	2.2	17	3.6	33	6.3	18	3.3
50 - 54	8	1.4	9	1.9	29	5.5	21	3.8
Below 50	35	6.0	18	3.8	63	11.9	48	8.8
Total...	590	100.0	476	100.0	528	100.0	548	100.0
Median Score	78		80		71		80	

Comments:

1. On each test, a significant minority of participants failed to reach the level specified for immediate campus placement. The percent below this threshold is: Usage--34.9, Oral--47.4, Vocab/Rdg--31.8, and Listening--19.4.
2. On each test, some participants failed to score at the level specified to come to the U.S. The percent below the lower threshold is: Usage--13.2, Oral--15.8, Vocab/Rdg--11.9, Listening--8.8. Technically, participants with these scores should remain at home for further language training.
3. The variation across the four tests in the percent of participants meeting either threshold suggests that the AID standards are not uniformly applied. For example, it appears much more difficult to score satisfactorily on the Oral as compared to the Listening test even though both tests have the same median score. This suggests a review of the test thresholds for consistency.

In order to ascertain the extent to which participants met AID score thresholds, each participant's four scores were compared with the thresholds. Table VI-8 shows the numbers of ALI/GU test-score thresholds, as prescribed by AID for immediate Call-forward or for Call-forward to ALI/GU, which were met by various numbers of participants tested overseas. These scores were used for Call-forward either for college placement or for English language institute placement.

TABLE VI-8

NUMBERS OF AID PARTICIPANTS ACHIEVING VARIOUS ALI/GU TEST-SCORE THRESHOLDS OVERSEAS

Number of Test-score Thresholds Met	For Immediate Call-forward (US-80, OR-80, VR-65, List-65)		For Call-forward to ALI/GU (US-65, OR-65, VR-50, List-50)	
	N	%	N	%
4 of 4	141	36	289	75
3 of 4	103	27	60	15
2 of 4	75	19	22	6
1 of 4	46	12	8	2
0 of 4	23	6	9	2
Total...	388*	100	388	100

---

*This total excludes:

a. 238 Vietnamese participants who were called forward without regard to ALI/GU scores.
b. 141 participants who received country waivers.
c. 205 participants who were missing one, two, or three ALI/GU test scores.
d. 32 participants who were missing all four ALI/GU test scores.

Comments:

1. While only 36 percent of the 388 participants met all four of the ALI/GU test-score thresholds for immediate Call-forward for college placement, it should be understood that the AID Manual Order 1382.3 permits minor modification of these thresholds.
2. Three-fourths (75 percent) of the participants met all four of the minimum requirements for Call-forward to ALI/GU.

The ALI/GU scores achieved in the U.S. are shown in Table VI-9 with the horizontal lines again indicating the AID thresholds.

TABLE VI-9

DISTRIBUTION OF U.S. ALI/GU SCORES

Scores	Test					
	Usage		Voc/Rdg		List.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
95 - 100	181	19.9	26	2.9	158	17.4
90 - 94	210	23.1	41	4.5	137	15.1
85 - 89	136	14.9	76	8.4	129	14.2
80 - 84	96	10.6	103	11.4	102	11.2
75 - 79	106	11.6	129	14.2	85	9.4
70 - 76	60	6.6	121	13.3	85	9.4
65 - 69	35	3.8	108	11.9	54	5.9
60 - 64	26	2.9	77	8.5	40	4.4
55 - 59	13	1.4	68	7.5	34	3.7
50 - 54	11	1.2	46	5.1	29	3.2
Below 50	36	4.0	112	12.3	56	6.1
Total...	910	100.0	907	100.0	909	100.0
Median Score	87		72		83	

Comments:

1. These findings closely approximate those using overseas ALI/GU scores (Table VI-7) in that a significant minority of participants fail to reach the level specified for campus placement: Usage--31.5%, Vocab/Rdg--33.4%, and Listening--17.4%.
2. A number of participants continue to score below the level specified for being brought to the U.S: Usage--9.5%, Vocab/Rdg--12.3%, and Listening--6.1%.
3. Again the score thresholds for the Listening test are easier to achieve.

Table VI-10 shows the number of ALI/GU test-score thresholds which were met by various numbers of participants tested upon arrival in the U.S.

TABLE VI-10

NUMBERS OF AID PARTICIPANTS ACHIEVING VARIOUS ALI/GU TEST-SCORE THRESHOLDS IN THE U.S.

Number of Test-score Thresholds Met*	For Immediate Call-forward (US-80, VR-65, List-65)		For Call-forward to ALI/GU (US-65, VR-50, List-50)	
	N	%	N	%
3 of 3	473	52	749	83
2 of 3	216	24	94	10
1 of 3	123	13	37	4
0 of 3	97	11	29	3
Total...	909**	100	909	100

---

*Only three of the tests were given in the U.S.; the Oral test was not given.

**Does not include Vietnamese group #2.

Comments:

1. Approximately one-half (52 percent) of the participants met all three test-score requirements for immediate Call-forward to placement in college academic studies.
2. Approximately four-fifths (83 percent) of the participants met all three of the test-score thresholds for Call-forward to ALI/GU.

Extent of Deficiency.

While a total of 436 participants (48 percent) did not meet all three of the score thresholds for campus placement, the extent to which they departed from the threshold(s) should be considered. The extent of deviation can be assessed with reference to the standard error of measurement of each test.[1]

---

[1] The standard error (SE) of measurement of a test represents how large a score difference is likely to occur when the same person takes two equivalent forms of the same test. The score on one test would be expected to be within ± one standard error of the score on the other test in two out of three cases. Thus if the SE of a test was five and a person had a score of 50 on the test, he would be expected to score 45-55 on the retests in two-thirds of the cases. Two SE's (40-60 in this example) would cover 99% of the cases. The SE's of the ALI/GU tests are: Usage--3.5, Vocab/Rdg--4.3, Listening--6.0.

Table VI-11 shows the 344 participants who did not have all three requirements for immediate campus placement and who were placed directly on a campus (i.e., did not attend ALI/GU) who scored within one or two standard errors of the established threshold.

TABLE VI-11

EXTENT TO WHICH ALI/GU SCORES WERE BELOW ESTABLISHED THRESHOLDS FOR PARTICIPANTS WHO DID NOT ATTEND ALI/GU

A. Those with 1 score below the established threshold for immediate Call-forward

Extent of Deficiency	N	Totals
Low score was within 1 SE below threshold	63	
Low score was within 2 SE below threshold	56	
Low score was below 2 SE below threshold	65	
		184

B. Those with 2 scores below the established thresholds for immediate Call-forward

Extent of Deficiencies		
Both low scores were within 1 SE below threshold	10	
Both low scores were within 2 SE below threshold (but not both within 1 SE below threshold)	18	
One or both low scores were below 2 SE below threshold	67	
		95

C. Those with 3 scores below the established thresholds for immediate Call-forward

Extent of Deficiencies		
All three scores were within 2 SE below threshold	1	
One or more scores were below 2 SE below threshold	64	
		65
Total...		344

Comment. If a score within one standard error of the threshold is considered a minor score deviation, only 73 of the 344 participants (21%) could be considered minor modifications. If two standard errors were considered a minor deviation 43% of these cases would be minor modifications.

The remainder of the 436 participants who did not meet all three requirements for immediate campus placement attended ALI/GU. Shifting to the lower thresholds for Call-forward to ALI/GU (Usage--65, V/R--50), Table VI-12 shows the number of participants within one or two standard errors of these thresholds.

TABLE VI-12

EXTENT TO WHICH ALI/GU SCORES WERE BELOW ESTABLISHED THRESHOLDS FOR PARTICIPANTS WHO ATTENDED ALI/GU

		N	Totals
A.	Those with no score below the established threshold for Call-forward to ALI/GU	40	40
B.	Those with 1 score below the established threshold for Call-forward to ALI/GU		
	Extent of Deficiency		
	Low score was within 1 SE below threshold	7	
	Low score was within 2 SE below threshold	4	
	Low score was below 2 SE below threshold	11	22
C.	Those with 2 scores below the established thresholds for Call-forward to ALI/GU		
	Extent of Deficiencies		
	One or both low scores were below 2 SE below threshold	14	14
D.	Those with 3 scores below the established thresholds for Call-forward to ALI/GU		
	Extent of Deficiencies		
	All three scores were within 2 SE below threshold	1	
	One or more scores were below 2 SE below threshold	15	16
	Total...		92

Comment. Of the 52 participants who had a score deficiency, only seven were within one standard error of the threshold.

3. ALI/GU vs. TOEFL. U.S. colleges and universities increasingly are requiring reliable evidence of English proficiency from foreign applicants for admission before permission to enroll will be granted. These requirements usually are stated in terms of the TOEFL or other tests of English as a foreign language. College admissions officers are faced with policy issues and procedural problems when the scores they receive come from a variety of test programs. Some institutions will accept only scores from the test they require. Other institutions are willing to make the admission decisions on any of the available test programs, provided they are assured of valid and interpretable English proficiency scores.

Table VI-13 has been constructed for that purpose, using the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of ALI/GU and TOEFL to compute (1) a TOEFL score range, and (2) a "best predicted" TOEFL score, from various ALI/GU total scores. The correlation between the total scores on the two tests is .84.

TABLE VI-13

TOEFL SCORE RANGES AND BEST PREDICTION OF TOEFL TOTAL SCORES COMPUTED FROM VARIOUS ALI/GU TOTAL SCORES

Total of Three ALI/GU Tests Usage, Voc-Read., Listening	TOEFL Score Range	Best Prediction of TOEFL Total Score
290	521-610	565
280	508-596	552
270	494-582	538
260	480-569	525
250	467-555	511
240	453-542	498
230	440-528	484
220	426-515	470
210	413-501	457
200	399-487	443
190	386-474	430
180	372-460	416
170	359-447	403
160	345-433	389
150	331-420	379

Interpretation: For a given ALI/GU score one could expect that a participant's TOEFL score would fall within the range indicated in two out of three cases. The midpoint of that range is the best prediction of the total TOEFL score.

Table VI-14 is an experience table showing the percentage of participants who exceeded specific ALI/GU total-score ranges. It is based on 981 noncontract participants who took the complete ALI/GU (except Oral) and TOEFL tests upon arrival in the U.S.

TABLE VI-14

ALI/GU TOEFL TOTAL SCORE EXPECTANCY TABLE

ALI/GU Total Score (Except Oral) Range	Percent of TOEFL Total Scores Which Exceeded				Number of Participants
	400	450	500	550	
270-300	99	99	97	81	122
260-369	99	99	84	40	98
250-259	99	95	76	19	105
240-249	98	81	42	7	107
230-239	98	79	34	5	119
220-229	89	60	12	0	82
210-219	80	61	11	0	72
190-209	79	32	4	0	84
150-189	52	10	1	1	101
less than 150	8	0	0	0	91
				Total...	981

4. Call-forward and Placement Procedures. AID has specified minimum ALI/GU scores, noted earlier in this chapter, for bringing a participant to the U.S. and for placing him at an institution for either academic study or English language preparation. Tables VI-15, 16 and 17 present data on how closely these AID placement criteria are followed. For ease in reading these tables the following ALI/GU-score headings will be used:

a. 80, 65, 65: All requirements met for immediate Call-forward for campus placement.

b. 65, 50, 50--ELI: All requirements not met for Call-forward for campus placement but all requirements met Call-forward to ALI/GU and participant attended ALI/GU or an English Language Institute (ELI).

c. 65, 50, 50--Campus: Same as (b), but participant went directly to a campus rather than to ALI/GU or an ELI.

d. Low--ELI: All requirements for Call-forward to ALI/GU not met and participant attended ALI/GU or an ELI.

e. Low--Campus: Same as (d), but participant went directly to a campus rather than to ALI/GU or an ELI.

TABLE VI-15

DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS WHO MET VARIOUS AID MINIMUM ALI/GU TEST SCORE THRESHOLDS AND THEIR PLACEMENT OUTCOMES, BASED ON FOUR ALI/GU TESTS TAKEN OVERSEAS

ALI/GU Thresholds Met	N	%
80, 65, 65	141	36
65, 50, 50--ELI	20	5
65, 50, 50--Campus	128	33
Low--ELI	35	9
Low--Campus	64	17
Total...	388	100

Comments:

1. Forty-two percent of the participants were handled strictly in accordance with AID minimum score thresholds.
2. Of the 247 participants who did not meet all requirements for immediate college placement only 55 (22%) actually attended ALI/GU or an ELI. The remaining 78% had scores which indicated the need for further English training but did not receive such training before enrolling in programs of academic study.

Because a large number (106) of the participants had all scores except their Oral score, Table VI-16 is presented to include these participants. Table VI-16 thus parallels Table VI-15.

TABLE VI-16

DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS WHO MET VARIOUS AID MINIMUM ALI/GU TEST THRESHOLDS AND THEIR PLACEMENT OUTCOMES, BASED ON THREE ALI/GU TESTS TAKEN OVERSEAS

ALI/GU Thresholds Met	N	%
80, 65, 65	257	52
65, 50, 50--ELI	23	5
65, 50, 50--Campus	119	24
Low--ELI	31	6
Low--Campus	63	13
Total...	493	100

Comments:

1. Fifty-seven percent of the participants were handled strictly in accordance with AID minimum score thresholds. This is significantly higher than in the previous table indicating that the Oral score was commonly the only score below the minimum level.

2. Of the 237 participants who did not meet all requirements for immediate college placement, only 54 (23%) actually attended ALI/GU or an ELI. The remaining 77% had scores which indicated the need for further English training but did not receive such training before enrolling in programs of academic study.

Table VI-17 presents information similar to the data in Tables VI-15 and VI-16 except that the ALI/GU tests were taken upon arrival in the U.S., and only three tests were given. (The Oral test was omitted.)

TABLE VI-17

DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS WHO MET VARIOUS AID MINIMUM ALI/GU TEST SCORE THRESHOLDS AND THEIR PLACEMENT OUTCOMES, BASED ON ALI/GU TESTS TAKEN UPON ARRIVAL IN THE U.S.

ALI/GU Thresholds Met	N	%
80, 65, 65	473	52
65, 50, 50--ELI	41	4
65, 50, 50--Campus	235	26
Low--ELI	51	6
Low--Campus	109	12
Total...	909	100

Comments:

1. Fifty-six percent of the participants were called forward and placed in strict accordance with AID score thresholds.

2. Of the 436 participants who did not meet all three requirements for immediate college placement 92 (21%) actually attended ALI/GU or an ELI. The remaining 79% had scores which indicated the need for further English training but did not receive such training before enrolling in programs of academic studies.

Another factor in evaluating AID's system for assessing language readiness is the stability of the Call-forward ALI/GU scores.

Table VI-18 shows the mean scores earned on the ALI/GU tests by 479 participants who took all the tests both overseas and upon arrival in the U.S. The correlations between the two sets of scores are also given.

TABLE VI-18

MEAN SCORES EARNED ON THE ALI/GU TESTS BY 479 PARTICIPANTS OVERSEAS AND UPON ARRIVAL IN THE U.S., AND THE CORRELATION BETWEEN THESE SCORES

	Overseas		Upon Arrival		Correlation (r) Between Scores Earned Overseas and Upon Arrival
ALI/GU Test	X	SD*	X	SD	
English Usage	81.4	15.4	83.4	12.6	.60
Voc.-Reading	68.9	15.9	69.9	14.2	.68
Listening	76.5	17.5	79.4	15.0	.63

---

*SD = Standard Deviation, an index of variability.

Comments:

1. These 479 participants scored slightly higher on the ALI/GU tests taken upon arrival than they had on the tests taken overseas earlier. The score increase was statistically significant on both the Usage and Listening tests.
2. The correlations show a substantial positive relationship. One could expect that in two out of three cases the U.S. ALI/GU score would fall within plus or minus 13 points (standard error of estimate) of the overseas score.

Remarks: In interpreting these data it should be understood that there was wide variation in the time lapse between the two tests and in the amount of exposure to English which occurred between the two tests.

English Waivers.

AID authorizes waivers on the English language testing "in countries where English is the major medium of communication."[1] In our sample 110 participants came with English waivers from 11 countries. Table VI-19 shows how the 108 participants with complete test scores did on the three ALI/GU tests taken upon arrival in the U.S.

TABLE VI-19

DISTRIBUTION OF AID PARTICIPANTS HAVING ENGLISH WAIVERS FROM VARIOUS COUNTRIES IN TERMS OF WHETHER THEY MET ALL THREE SCORE REQUIREMENTS FOR IMMEDIATE CALL-FORWARD AND COLLEGE PLACEMENT (USAGE-80, VOCABULARY-READING-65, LISTENING-65)

		Participants Meeting All Three Requirements	
Country	Total Number of Participants	N	%
Kenya	21	21	100
Nigeria	7	7	100
Ghana	4	4	100
Jamaica	2	2	100
Philippines	2	2	100
Sierra Leone	2	2	100
Guyana	1	1	100
Uganda	21	19	90
Tanzania	6	4	67
Pakistan	31	7	23
India	11	2	18
Total...	108	71	66 Average

---

[1] AID Manual Order, op. cit., p. 1.

Comments:

1. Twenty-one percent of the participants from India and Pakistan justified the English test waivers, whereas 94 percent of the participants from the other nine countries did so.
2. Since 33 of the 37 participants who failed to meet the test-score requirements when tested in the U.S. were from Pakistan and India, AID should review its English waiver policies and practices in these two countries.

English test waivers may also be authorized by Missions in other countries for participants who are completely bilingual.* Twenty-eight participants received individual waivers and their TOEFL scores are shown in Table VI-20.

TABLE VI-20

TOEFL SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WITH INDIVIDUAL ENGLISH TEST WAIVERS

TOEFL Total	N	%
550+	13	46
450 - 549	9	32
300 - 449	6	22
200 - 299	0	0
Total...	28	100

Comment. While the majority of participants who received these individual waivers would appear to justify them, a significant minority(22%) clearly did not.

---

*AID Manual Order 1382.3, op. cit.

Effects on Performance

1. Further English Preparation. The readiness of AID participants to undertake academic study upon arrival in the U.S. may be assessed by examining how much additional English training is required in the U.S. Two kinds of English training can be identified: (1) Full-time at ALI/GU or other English language institute, or (2) part-time while concurrently taking some academic work. Table VI-21 indicates the extent of full-time English preparation of over two-weeks duration required of the participants.

TABLE VI-21

EXTENT OF FULL-TIME ENGLISH STUDY PRIOR TO ACADEMIC ENROLLMENT

	N	%
Full-time English study	153	15.2
No full-time English study	851	84.8
Total...	1004	100.0

Comment. It should be noted that 41 of the 153 participants involved in full-time noncredit English language study were a part of a special group of 77 Vietnamese teachers who were atypical participants. Excluding this group, 12.1% of the participants were involved in full-time English study.

The length of time of participants' programs is shown in Table VI-22.

TABLE VI-22

DURATION OF FULL-TIME ENGLISH TRAINING IN THE U.S.

Months of Preparation	Regular Participants		Vietnamese Group		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	48	43.0	0	0.0	48	31.4
2	22	19.6	0	0.0	22	14.4
3	8	7.1	18	43.9	26	17.0
4	10	8.9	21	51.2	31	20.2
5+	24	21.4	2	4.9	26	17.0
Total. . .	112	100.0	41	100.0	153	100.0

Comments:

1. Regular participants tended to have shorter term English training than the Vietnamese group.
2. Overall, 83% had training that was completed in one semester (4.5 months) or less.

The number of months of preparation is related to English proficiency at arrival as shown in Table VI-23 (excludes Vietnamese group).

TABLE VI-23

ALI/GU SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WITH VARIOUS AMOUNTS OF FULL-TIME ENGLISH STUDY

Months of Full-Time English Study on Arrival	Mean ALI/GU Total Score	N
1	206	49
2	207	22
3 or 4	162	18
5 or more	136	24
Total...	184	113

Comment. The mean scores for participants with one or two months of English study are significantly higher ($p < .01$) than for participants with three, four, or more months.

Campus representatives were asked to report whether additional preparatory work was required on campus and, if so, how many semester hours equivalents were involved. Tables VI-24 and 25 show these data.

TABLE VI-24

PREPARATORY ENGLISH ON CAMPUS

	Undergraduate		Graduate		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
English required on campus	232	56	197	37	429	45
English not required on campus	186	44	338	63	524	55
Total...	418	100	535	100	953	100

Comments:

1. Forty-five percent of the participants were required to take English on campus.
2. Undergraduates were much more likely than graduates to have to take English (56% vs 37%).

TABLE VI-25

AMOUNT OF PREPARATORY WORK IN ENGLISH ON CAMPUS

	Participants	
Semester Hours	N	%
1 - 3	104	24.3
4 - 6	135	31.4
7 - 9	34	7.9
10 - 12	30	7.0
13 - 15	25	5.8
16+	12	2.8
Not indicated	89	20.8
Total...	429	100.0

Comments:

1. In a majority of cases, participants were required to take only one or two English courses in their first year (six semester hours or less). This probably would not necessitate a reduced academic load.
2. Over 100 participants took seven or more hours of English on campus. This seems large considering that AID participants are supposed to be prepared for full-time academic study upon arrival on campus.

While it could be assumed that the participants required to take English on campus are those whose scores indicate a need for such further training, it is also possible that some institutions routinely place all foreign students in such classes. To test this possibility, Table VI-26 shows the number of participants required to take English on campus in each of the five subgroups reported earlier.

TABLE VI-26

ENGLISH REQUIRED ON CAMPUS ACCORDING TO U.S. ALI/GU SCORES

Subgroup	English		No English		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
80 65, 65	171	36	304	64	475	100
65, 50, 50--ELI	16	37	27	63	43	100
65, 50, 50--Campus	108	48	119	52	227	100
Low--ELI	49	70	21	30	70	100
Low--Campus	85	62	53	38	138	100
Total...	429		524		953	

Comments:

1. There is a clear tendency for the subgroups with better English preparation to take less English on campus. The top two subgroups (those placed strictly in accordance with AID standards) were required to take preparatory English in 36% of the cases compared with 56% in the other three subgroups combined.
2. The finding that 36% of those in the top two subgroups still had to take some English suggests that AID thresholds should be reviewed.

Performance.

The ultimate test of the AID system of evaluating English proficiency and providing EFL training lies in the performance of the participants and the extent to which English proficiency is related to that performance. Chapter VII describes the overall performance of AID participants and Chapter VIII deals with the prediction of that performance from test scores and other preadmission variables. The AID system of Call-forward and placement alternatives based on ALI/GU scores is related to performance in Table VI-27. As in the previous table, the five subgroups according to U.S. ALI/GU scores and placement outcomes are compared. In Table VI-27 the comparison is on first year grade-point average.

TABLE VI-27

MEDIAN FIRST YEAR GPA ACCORDING TO U.S. ALI/GU SCORES

Subgroup	Undergraduate GPA	Graduate GPA
80, 65, 65	3.1	3.2
65, 50, 50--ELI	3.0	3.2
65, 50, 50--Campus	2.8	3.1
Low--ELI	2.6	3.0
Low--Campus	2.8	3.1

Comments:

1. There is a tendency for the subgroups better prepared in English to achieve better grades in their first year. This trend is more pronounced for undergraduates than for graduates.
2. It should also be noted, however, that all subgroups are performing at a generally acceptable level, even where English background would seem to be deficient.

It has been pointed out earlier that performance has both a quality and quantity component. To examine the relationship between English preparation and quantity, Table VI-28 shows the median number of semester hours earned in the first year by each of the same five subgroups.

TABLE VI-28

MEDIAN CREDITS EARNED IN FIRST YEAR ACCORDING TO U.S. ALI/GU SCORES

Subgroup	Undergraduate Semester Credits		Graduate Semester Credits	
80, 65, 65	28		23	
65, 50, 50--ELI	21	25	19	22
65, 50, 50--Campus	26		22	
Low--ELI	20	22	20	18
Low--Campus	24		18	

Comments:

1. There is a general tendency for the subgroups with better English preparation to complete more academic credits during their first year of study. The trend is especially clear when the groups with equivalent ALI/GU scores are combined as shown in Table VI-28.
2. The finding that "Campus" subgroups completed more credits than the "ELI" subgroup was unexpected and cannot be explained from the present data.

Summary and Conclusions.

The participants in this Study came to the U.S. with a wide variety of English language backgrounds. A few participants considered English their native language and about one-quarter attended a school where English was the language of instruction. For most participants, however, contact with English came through courses in English in school. While most participants studied English for several years, the quality of English instruction around the world is not such that it provides every participant with adequate English preparation.

The English proficiency test scores, both overseas and U.S., confirm the wide range of English competence of this sample. Depending on the test(s) used, from one-third to one-half of the participants appear to lack sufficient command of English to begin a full academic program upon arrival.

There is wide divergence from AID English standards in the calling forward and institutional placement of participants. About one-half the cases are handled strictly in accordance with the formal guidelines. Apparently criteria other than English proficiency were given more weight in this placement process.

AID policy for waiving English testing also deserves review. In the case of the country waiver policy, India and Pakistan do not seem to justify waivers. Individual waivers for bilinguals can also be questioned in some cases.

As might be expected from the deficiencies in English preparation just noted, there is a great deal of English training in the U.S. undergone by the participants. Fifteen percent required full-time English instruction prior to enrollment for academic study and 45% were required to take English concurrently with their regular academic work. The amount of additional English instruction required is clearly related to English proficiency on arrival.

Academic performance is similarly related to English proficiency as measured on arrival. Lower academic performance was found, both in quantity and quality, among participants less well prepared in English. This relationship is further documented in Chapter VIII.

CHAPTER VII

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

The extent to which AID participants succeed academically and accomplish their training objectives is described in this chapter. Academic performance of the participants was evaluated in terms of several criteria. For both undergraduate and graduate participants, transcripts of their work at U.S. universities and colleges were obtained from the campus representatives. Faculty ratings of academic performance also were obtained for the graduate participants. By comparing the PIO/P with the transcript, an assessment was made of the extent to which each participant completed his original training objective and/or degree objective.

The chapter is organized so as to present first the findings for undergraduates and then those for the graduate participants. For each group, the data regarding quantity of academic work attempted and completed and the quality of academic performance are presented in that order.

Academic Performance of the Undergraduates

Amount of Work Attempted and Completed.

A "normal" full-time course load for domestic undergraduate students is 30 credit hours per academic year. For purposes of this study, a range of 12-17 credit hours will be considered a normal undergraduate course load for one term with 24 semester hours constituting a minimum full-time program for an academic year.

Table VII-1 shows the credits attempted and earned by the undergraduates during their first and second terms of work. It should be noted in reading Table VII-1 that not necessarily the same persons are tabulated in a given interval for both credits attempted and credits earned. For example, 87 participants attempted 15-17. One cannot assume that all of the 81 persons who completed 15-17 credits are included in the 87 since some of the 81 may have attempted 18 or more credits.

Therefore, in some intervals of the table there are more participants who earned a given number of credits than who attempted that number. The same explanation for this apparent discrepancy applies to other tables later in this chapter which summarize credits attempted and earned.

TABLE VII-1

FIRST AND SECOND TERM CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED AND EARNED BY UNDERGRADUATE PARTICIPANTS

	First Term				Second Term			
	Credits Attempted		Credits Earned		Credits Attempted		Credits Earned	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
18 and above	29	7.1	21	5.2	61	15.4	55	13.8
15 - 17	87	21.4	81	20.0	125	31.3	111	27.8
12 - 14	135	33.3	129	31.8	134	33.6	139	34.8
9 - 11	76	18.7	85	20.9	41	10.3	47	11.8
6 - 8	41	10.1	44	10.8	17	4.3	22	5.5
3 - 5	15	3.7	19	4.7	10	2.4	13	3.3
2 or less	23	5.7	27	6.6	11	2.7	12	3.0
Total...	406	100.0	406	100.0	399	100.0	399	100.0
Not available	32		32		39		39	
	438		438		438		438	

Comments:

1. The median number of credits attempted during the first term is 13 and the median number completed is 12.
2. On the average, the undergraduates attempt and complete 14 credit hours during the second term.
3. Twenty-nine percent of the undergraduate participants attempt a credit load of 15 hours or more during the first term.
4. The percentage carrying 15 credit hours or more increases to 48% during the second term.
5. Twenty-five percent earn at least 15 credits during the first term and the percentage increases to 41% during the second term.
6. Thirty-eight percent attempt fewer than 12 hours during the first term and the percentage decreases to 20% during the second term.

Table VII-2 presents the distribution of first-year semester-hour credits attempted and earned.

TABLE VII-2

FIRST YEAR CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED AND EARNED BY UNDERGRADUATE PARTICIPANTS

	Credits Attempted		Credits Earned	
	N	%	N	%
36 and above	23	5.8	15	3.7
30 - 35	110	27.6	97	24.4
24 - 29	142	35.7	142	35.7
18 - 23	68	17.1	76	19.1
12 - 17	36	9.0	43	10.8
6 - 11	11	2.8	15	3.8
5 or less	8	2.0	10	2.5
Total...	398	100.0	398	100.0
Not available	40		40	
	438		438	

Comments:

1. On the average, undergraduate participants attempt 27 credit hours during their first year of academic work in the U.S. and complete 26 of those credits.
2. Sixty-four percent of the undergraduates complete a "normal" academic course load during the first year (at least 24 semester hours).

Grade-point Average (GPA).

Table VII-3 reports the grade-point average distributions for the first and second terms for the undergraduate participants.

TABLE VII-3

FIRST AND SECOND TERM GPA DISTRIBUTIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATES

GPA	First Term		Second Term	
	N	%	N	%
3.5 - 4.0	108	27.8	88	22.7
3.0 - 3.4	93	24.0	110	28.3
2.5 - 2.9	82	21.1	92	23.7
2.0 - 2.4	71	18.2	68	17.5
1.5 - 1.9	20	5.1	17	4.4
1.0 - 1.4	10	2.6	11	2.8
0.5 - 0.9	2	0.5	1	0.3
Below 0.5	3	0.7	1	0.3
Total...	389	100.0	388	100.0
Not available	49		50	
	438		438	

	First Term	Second Term
Mean GPA	2.86	2.88
Standard Deviation	.75	.66

Comments:

1. Over 90% of the undergraduates earned a C average or above during the first term in the U.S.
2. During the second term the percentage who earned above a C average increased to 93%.
3. Slightly over half of the undergraduates earned a B average or higher during both the first and second terms.

Table VII-4 presents undergraduate GPA distributions for the first and second years of study in a U.S. university or college.

TABLE VII-4

FIRST AND SECOND YEAR GPA DISTRIBUTIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATES

GPA	First Year		Second Year	
	N	%	N	%
3.5 - 4.0	80	20.5	82	23.0
3.0 - 3.4	104	26.6	118	33.0
2.5 - 2.9	108	27.6	86	24.0
2.0 - 2.4	70	18.0	54	15.0
1.5 - 1.9	18	4.6	15	4.1
1.0 - 1.4	9	2.3	2	0.6
0.5 - 0.9	1	0.2	1	0.3
Below 0.5	1	0.2	0	0.0
Total...	391	100.0	358	100.0
Not available	47		80	
	438		438	

	First Year	Second Year
Mean GPA	2.86	2.97
Standard Deviation	.65	.59

Comments:

1. Ninety-three percent of the undergraduates earned a C average or above during the first year in the U.S.
2. During the second year the percentage who earned above a C average increased to 95%.
3. Forty-seven percent of the undergraduates earned a B average or higher during the first year and this percentage increased to 56% during the second year.

Graduate Participants' Academic Performance

Quantity of Work Attempted and Completed.

Table VII-5 shows the extent to which the graduate participants earned credit for course work which they attempted during their first and second terms of study. A "normal" full-time course load for domestic graduate students is 24 credit hours per academic year. For purposes of this study, a range of 9-15 credit hours will be considered a normal graduate course load for one term with 18 semester hours constituting a minimum full-time program for an academic year.

TABLE VII-5

FIRST AND SECOND TERM CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED AND EARNED BY GRADUATE PARTICIPANTS

	First Term				Second Term			
	Credits Attempted		Credits Earned		Credits Attempted		Credits Earned	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
18 and above	13	2.4	6	1.2	20	3.9	14	2.7
15 - 17	70	13.0	57	10.6	86	16.8	76	14.8
12 - 14	177	33.0	160	29.8	195	38.0	187	36.5
9 - 11	149	27.8	163	30.4	128	25.0	133	25.9
6 - 8	85	15.9	88	16.4	67	13.1	77	15.0
3 - 5	24	4.5	39	7.3	11	2.1	16	3.1
2 or less	18	3.4	23	4.3	6	1.1	10	2.0
Total...	536	100.0	536	100.0	513	100.0	513	100.0
Not available	30		30		53		53	
	566		566		566		566	

Comments:

1. During the first term, the graduate participants attempt and complete an average of 11 credit hours.
2. On the average, the graduate participants attempt and complete 12 credit hours during the second term.
3. Forty-eight percent of the graduate participants attempt a credit load of 12 hours or more during the first term.
4. The percentage carrying 12 credit hours or more increased to 59% during the second term.
5. Forty-two percent earn at least 12 credits during the first term and the percentage increases to 54% during the second term.
6. Twenty-five percent earn fewer than nine hours during the first term and the percentage decreases to 20% during the second term.

Table VII-6 presents the distribution of first year semester hour credits attempted and earned.

TABLE VII-6

FIRST-YEAR CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED AND EARNED BY GRADUATE PARTICIPANTS

	Credits Attempted		Credits Earned	
	N	%	N	%
36 and above	7	1.3	3	0.6
30 - 35	52	10.1	41	7.9
24 - 29	184	35.7	177	34.3
18 - 23	178	34.5	173	33.5
12 - 17	71	13.8	81	15.7
6 - 11	19	3.7	33	6.4
5 or less	5	0.9	8	1.6
Total...	516	100.0	516	100.0
Not available	50		50	
	566		566	

Comments:

1. On the average, graduate participants attempt 23 credit hours during their first year of academic work in the U.S. and are able to complete 22 of these credits.
2. Seventy-six percent of the graduates complete a "normal" academic course load during the first year (at least 18 semester hours).

Length of Time to Complete Master's Degree.

Another index of the amount of work pursued in the U.S. by graduate participants is the length of time they spend in academic study completing degree requirements. A sufficiently large group of Master's degree recipients was available in the Study to provide a meaningful analysis of such information. Table VII-7 summarizes the number of months of academic work required from initial enrollment for academic study to completion of degree requirements for the M.A. That is, no English language training time is included in this tabulation.

TABLE VII-7

NUMBER OF MONTHS OF ACADEMIC STUDY REQUIRED FOR ATTAINMENT OF THE MASTER'S DEGREE

Number of Months	N	%
30 or more	0	0.0
27 - 29	13	4.9
24 - 26	1	0.4
21 - 23	23	8.6
18 - 20	57	21.3
15 - 17	73	27.3
12 - 14	44	16.5
9 - 11	56	21.0
8 or less	0	0.0
Total...	267	100.0

Comments:

1. On the average, graduate participants pursuing a Master's degree spent 16 months of academic study completing the M.A. requirements.
2. About one-fifth of those who obtained a Master's degree did so in less than 12 months of academic study.

Table VII-8 presents the number of calendar months spent in the U.S. from initial entry in the Study to completion of M.A. degree requirements. Any English language training time is therefore included in this tabulation.

TABLE VII-8

NUMBER OF CALENDAR MONTHS REQUIRED FOR ATTAINMENT OF THE MASTER'S DEGREE

Number of Months	N	%
33 or more	0	0.0
30 - 32	4	1.5
27 - 29	16	6.0
24 - 26	24	9.0
21 - 23	66	24.7
18 - 20	43	16.1
15 - 17	61	22.9
12 - 14	39	14.6
9 - 11	14	5.2
8 or less	0	0.0
Total...	267	100.0

Comments:

1. On the average, graduate participants pursuing a Master's degree spent 19 calendar months completing the M.A. requirements.
2. About 5% of those who obtained a Master's degree did so in less than 12 calendar months.

Grade-point Average (GPA).

Table VII-9 reports the grade-point average distributions for the first and second terms for the graduate participants.

TABLE VII-9

FIRST AND SECOND TERM GPA DISTRIBUTIONS FOR GRADUATE PARTICIPANTS

GPA	First Term		Second Term	
	N	%	N	%
3.5 - 4.0	147	28.4	191	38.0
3.0 - 3.4	210	40.5	213	42.4
2.5 - 2.9	87	16.8	59	11.8
2.0 - 2.4	52	10.0	27	5.4
1.5 - 1.9	15	2.9	9	1.8
1.0 - 1.4	4	0.8	3	0.6
0.5 - 0.9	3	0.6	0	0.0
Below 0.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total...	518	100.0	502	100.0
Not available	48		64	
	566		566	

	First Term	Second Term
Mean GPA	3.08	3.16
Standard Deviation	.58	.49

Comments:

1. Sixty-nine percent of the graduates earned a grade average of B or above during the first term in the U.S.
2. During the second term the percentage who earned above a B average increased to 80%.
3. Twenty-eight percent of the graduate participants earned a grade average of B+ or higher during the first term and this percentage increased to 38% during the second term.

Table VII-10 presents graduate GPA distributions for the first and second years of study in a U.S. university or college.

TABLE VII-10

FIRST AND SECOND YEAR GPA DISTRIBUTIONS FOR GRADUATE PARTICIPANTS

GPA	First Year		Second Year	
	N	%	N	%
3.5 - 4.0	141	27.6	142	34.2
3.0 - 3.4	241	47.3	195	46.9
2.5 - 2.9	87	17.1	57	13.7
2.0 - 2.4	27	5.3	15	3.6
1.5 - 1.9	10	1.9	6	1.4
1.0 - 1.4	1	0.2	0	0.0
0.5 - 0.9	3	0.6	0	0.0
Below 0.5	0	0.0	1	0.2
Total...	510	100.0	416	100.0
Not available	56		150	
	566		566	

	First Year	Second Year
Mean GPA	3.15	3.24
Standard Deviation	.50	.46

Comments:

1. Seventy-five percent of the graduate participants earned a grade average of B or above during the first year in the U.S.
2. During the second year the percentage who earned above a B average increased to 81%.
3. Twenty-eight percent of the graduate participants earned a B+ average or higher during the first year and this percentage increased to 34% during the second year.

Faculty Ratings of Graduate Participants' Performance.

The campus representative was asked to obtain from the faculty person who best knew each graduate participant a rating of the participant's academic performance relative to all other students in the same graduate program at that institution. Table VII-11 summarizes these ratings for the graduate participants.

TABLE VII-11

FACULTY RATINGS OF GRADUATE PARTICIPANTS' ACADEMIC WORK RELATIVE TO THE PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STUDENTS IN THE SAME PROGRAM

Rating	N	%
Superior	40	8.6
Above Average	141	30.4
Average	194	41.9
Marginal	66	14.3
Inadequate	22	4.8
Total...	463	100.0
Not available	103	
	566	

Comments:

1. Over 80% of the graduate participants were rated average and above as compared with other students in the same program.
2. Nearly 40% were rated above average or superior to the other graduate students.
3. The academic work of less than 5% of the graduate participants was judged to be inadequate by institutional standards.

A faculty person was also asked to rate each graduate participant's performance in relation to the quality of work demonstrated by other foreign students. Table VII-12 presents these ratings.

TABLE VII-12

FACULTY RATINGS OF GRADUATE PARTICIPANTS' ACADEMIC WORK RELATIVE TO THE PERFORMANCE OF OTHER FOREIGN STUDENTS IN THE SAME PROGRAM

Rating	N	%
Superior	136	29.5
Above Average	141	30.5
Average	129	27.9
Marginal	43	9.3
Inadequate	13	2.8
Total...	462	100.0
Not available	104	
	566	

Comments:

1. Nearly 90% of the graduate participants were rated average and above as compared with other foreign students in the same program.
2. Sixty percent were rated above average or superior to the other foreign students.
3. The academic work of less than 3% of the graduate participants was judged to be inadequate.

Academic Probation.

The campus representatives were asked to indicate whether or not each participant had been on academic probation during his first year of study. The results of this questionnaire item are reported in Table VII-13.

TABLE VII-13

EXTENT TO WHICH PARTICIPANTS WERE PLACED ON ACADEMIC PROBATION

	Undergraduate		Graduate		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
On probation	30	7.7	37	7.3	67	7.5
Not on probation	358	92.3	467	92.7	825	92.5
Total...	388	100.0	504	100.0	892	100.0
Not available	50		62		112*	
	438		566		1004	

---

*No CPQ received for 30 of these cases.

Comment. Over 90% of both the undergraduate and graduate participants were in good standing academically at the end of one year of study in the U.S.

Attainment of Training and Degree Objectives.

The extent to which each participant completed his training and/or degree objective was assessed by reviewing the PIO/P and the transcript of his academic work. Table VII-14 shows the data obtained for 586 participants who had completed their program of study.

TABLE VII-14

EXTENT TO WHICH PARTICIPANTS COMPLETED THEIR DEGREE AND TRAINING OBJECTIVES

	Undergraduates		Graduates		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Degree Objective:						
Met at one institution	71	43.8	250	59.0	321	54.8
Met at more than one institution	4	2.6	4	0.9	8	1.4
Not met	12	7.4	29	6.8	41	7.0
New degree objective approved and met	6	3.7	15	3.5	21	3.6
Received an unapproved degree	2	1.2	0	0.0	2	0.3
No Degree Objective:						
Training objective met	64	39.5	102	24.1	166	28.3
Training objective not met	3	1.8	11	2.6	14	2.4
Degree received	0	0.0	13	3.1	13	2.2
Total...	162	100.0	424	100.0	586	100.0
Not available	276		142		418	
	438		566		1004	

Comments:

1. Over 85% of the participants clearly met their degree or training objective.
2. Seven percent of the participants failed to receive the degree planned for them, and about 2% failed to complete their training objective where no degree was planned.

Summary and Conclusions.

With relatively few exceptions, AID participants demonstrate academic performance in U.S. institutions which compares very favorably with that of most domestic students and which is generally better than that of other foreign students.

The amount of academic work pursued by participants is slightly less than "normal" during the first year of study, but it does increase from the first to the second term. The typical graduate participant earns credit for all of the course work he attempts during his first term in the U.S. whereas the typical undergraduate completes one credit hour less than he attempts. About one-third of the undergraduates and one-fourth of the graduate participants earn credit for less than a normal full load of course work during the first year.

Over 90% of the undergraduates and 75% of the graduate participants earn grades which are clearly satisfactory during the first year of U.S. study. The quality of their work increases somewhat from the first to the second term of study, but there is not as dramatic a change in performance as might be expected in view of their non-English language backgrounds and other adjustments to academic work in the U.S.

Almost half of the undergraduates and a third of the graduates earned "above-average" grades during the first year. Such performance was demonstrated by substantially larger proportions during the second year of study.

At the end of the second year, about 5% of both the undergraduate and graduate participants were in serious academic difficulty. The faculty ratings for the graduate participants add further evidence that almost 5% are "inadequate" by institutional standards. When the graduate participants are compared with other foreign students, a few are judged to be "inadequate" and over 10% are rated below average. It seems clear that on any given index of performance a small proportion of the participants are found to be markedly deficient.

About 8% of the participants are placed on academic probation during their period of study in the U.S. This percentage undoubtedly includes the 5% who are seriously deficient in grade-point average at the end of two years.

Both AID and U.S. institutions should find reason for gratification in the fact that over 85% of the participants who completed their program of study successfully met their degree or nondegree training objective.

CHAPTER VIII

PREDICTION OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

The potential usefulness of tests in the AID selection process was a major question in the initial decision to undertake this Study. This chapter will examine the validity of test scores and other preadmission variables in the prediction of academic success of the participants. Such validity was studied by assessing the degree of relationship between factors available at the time of admission (predictor variables) and academic performance measures (criterion variables).

A total of 12 predictor variables were selected for study.

PREDICTOR	DEFINITION
1. Birth Year	Last two digits of year of birth.
2. Years Out	Number of years since last school attendance (Coded as in Table III-6, p. III-5).
3. Rank	Rank in class at last institution attended as estimated by participant upon arrival in the U.S.--upper 10%, upper 25%, upper 50%, lower 50%.
4. Q-Home	Quality of the participant's previous academic record in terms of home country standards as rated by AACRAO credential analyst--superior, above average, average, marginal, inadequate.
5. Q-U.S.	Quality of the participant's previous academic record in terms of the type of U.S. institution at which he would be able to do satisfactory academic work as rated by AACRAO credential analyst--highly competitive, competitive, average, not competitive, none.
6. Q-Inst.	Quality of the participant's previous academic record in terms of standards at the institution at which he

		was placed as rated by the receiving admissions officer--superior, above average, average, marginal, inadequate.
7.	ALI/GU	Combined total score on the three ALI/GU English tests taken on arrival in the U.S.--Usage (0-100), Vocabulary-Reading (0-100) and Listening (0-100); total range 0-300.
8.	TOEFL	Total score on TOEFL taken upon arrival in the U.S.--range 200-800.
9.	SAT-V	Verbal score on the Scholastic Aptitude Test taken by undergraduates upon arrival in the U.S.--range 200-800.
10.	SAT-M	Math score on the Scholastic Aptitude Test taken by undergraduates upon arrival in the U.S.--range 200-800.
11.	GRE-V	Verbal score on the Graduate Record Examination taken by graduate students upon arrival in the U.S.--range 200-800.
12.	GRE-Q	Quantitative score on the Graduate Record Examination taken by graduate students upon arrival in the U.S.--range 200-800.

Criteria.

The typical measure of academic success used as a criterion variable in prediction studies has been first-semester GPA. First-semester GPA would seem to be less appropriate as a criterion for foreign than for domestic students since the first semester tends to be more of an acclimatization period for foreign students than for domestic students and may be less representative of their true academic progress. Second semester and first-year GPA may be more reliable indicators of performance and have therefore been utilized as additional criterion measures.

Grade-point average, of course, measures only the quality component of academic performance. The quantity of academic work completed is also significant. There is a good deal of variation in the amount of credit completed by participants in their first year with some participants having taken mostly noncredit English courses. In an effort to more completely describe a participant's total progress, an "achievement index" was computed ($AI=GPA^2$ x credits earned) which includes both the quality and quantity of work taken.

Grade-point average has been particularly criticized as a measure of success for graduate students because the range of grades awarded is restricted (which suppresses correlations) and because grades may not adequately reflect the other capabilities which distinguish graduate from undergraduate studies--such as research skills or professionally oriented investigative and synthesizing skills. A graduate-student rating form was developed (see Appendix G) to supplement GPA and AI which asked the participant's major adviser to rate him in comparison with other foreign students in the field and with all other students in the field.

The criterion variables thus selected for study are:

CRITERION	DEFINITION
1. GPA-1	First semester grade-point average in courses in which a grade of A, B, C, D, or F was received (A=4, B=3, C=2, D=1, F=0). Other grading systems were converted to the A-F scale.
2. GPA-2	Second semester grade-point average.
3. GPA-Y	First-year grade-point average.
4. AI-1	First semester achievement index where AI= $(GPA)^2$ x credits earned.
5. AI-Y	First year achievement index.
6. Cred.	First year credits earned.
7. GR-Fs	Graduate student rating by major adviser in terms of comparison with other foreign students in the discipline--top 10%, next 20%, middle 40%, next 20%, lowest 10%.

8. GR-All — Graduate student rating by major adviser in terms of comparison with all other students in the discipline--top 10%, next 20%, middle 40%, next 20%, lowest 10%.

There is a systematic difference between graduate and undergraduate students on each of these criteria and therefore these two groups are treated separately in all subsequent analyses in the chapter.

Undergraduate Sample.

Table VIII-1 shows the correlation coefficient[1] between each predictor and each criterion for all undergraduate students. Correlations not significant (ns) at the .05 level are not shown (i.e., correlations that could result from chance 5 or more times per 100).

TABLE VIII-1

CORRELATION MATRIX--ALL UNDERGRADUATES

	CRITERIA					
PREDICTORS	GPA-1	AI-1	GPA-2	GPA-Y	AI-Y	CRED.
Birth Year	.20	.18	.38	.36	.30	ns
Years Out	ns	-.13	-.22	-.18	-.20	-.13
Rank	.11	.17	.13	.16	.23	.18
Q-Home	.25	.21	.25	.31	.28	.12
Q-U.S.	.23	.19	.26	.30	.26	ns
Q-Inst.	.30	.29	.30	.37	.31	.20
ALI/GU	.15	.26	.18	.23	.32	.23
TOEFL	.18	.29	.22	.25	.36	.24
SAT-V	.13	.25	.13	.18	.24	.12
SAT-M	.50	.46	.47	.55	.50	.12
N*	262-387	283-413	260-386	265-390	281-410	281-410

*Note: The number of pairs involved in each correlation varies due to missing information on some variables.

---

[1] A correlation coefficient is a number ranging from -1.00 to +1.00 that expresses the degree and direction of relationship between two variables. Two variables that are completely unrelated have a correlation of .00. A positive correlation implies that the higher the score on one variable the higher the score on the other. A negative correlation implies that the higher the score on one variable the lower the score on the other. The higher the magnitude of the correlation regardless of sign the more accurately one variable can be predicted from a knowledge of the other.

Comments:

1. Every predictor correlates significantly with most or all criteria, although most correlations are rather low.
2. SAT-Mathematics was clearly the best single predictor of academic success. A correlation of .55 with first-year GPA is higher than most individual colleges find with domestic students and is rather surprising considering the heterogeneity of the sample and of the colleges they attended.
3. Among the three sources of ratings of the quality of the participants' previous academic record (the participant, the AACRAO credential analyst and the receiving admissions officer) the campus ratings proved to be more predictive of success than the analysts' ratings, and the analysts' ratings more predictive than the participants' ratings (.37 vs. .30 vs. .16). The campus rating was expected to be most predictive in that the rater could compare the participant's previous quality with his knowledge of the competition on that campus in the particular department. It should be noted that the campus rating was completed after the participant had finished some academic work. The AACRAO credential analysts' ratings were made without knowledge of the actual placement. Still, these ratings predicted GPA significantly better than the participant's rank in class. It is perhaps not surprising, although disappointing, that rank was such a poor predictor. The ranks were achieved in the widest variety of educational institutions in nearly 40 countries and thus would not mean the same thing for all participants.
4. There is a tendency for younger participants and those most recently out of school (many of whom are the same people) to do better academically than older participants although the relationships are moderate at best.

5. English test scores did not predict GPA very well. To the extent they did, however, ALI/GU and TOEFL were of the same predictive value. As was pointed out earlier, they serve as better predictors for criteria involving quantity as well as quality of academic work.
6. First-year GPA was the most predictable measure of academic success, and number of credits earned in the first year was the least predictable.
7. Correlations utilizing second-semester GPA as the criterion measure are no higher, in general, than correlations using first-semester GPA. The expectation that second-semester GPA would be more predictable is not confirmed.
8. Correlations utilizing Achievement Index as the criterion measure are no higher, except when English tests are the predictors, than correlations using GPA as a criterion. The finding that English tests predict AI better than GPA may be due to the fact that low English scorers tend to take more remedial English courses on campus, thus taking fewer regular credits, thus reducing their AI.

Commentary on Correlations.

There are several reasons why low correlations would be expected in a sample like this.

1. Matching with Institutional Selectivity. The AID placement process is essentially one of matching the educational qualifications and objectives of the participant with the admission requirements and curricular offerings of the U.S. institution. The extent to which the matching works satisfactorily may be inferred from the overall level of performance of the participants. In trying to establish the validity of tests or ratings of academic quality, however, this matching of the academic strength of the participant with the competitiveness of the institution tends to obscure any

predictor-criterion relationships that may actually exist. If the matching were perfect (i.e., the best student to the best institution, etc.) the correlations should approximate zero. An attempt to subgroup participants according to the competitiveness of the institution they are attending has been made to attempt to offset the matching phenomenon, if any.

2. Geographic Diversity. The participants are a very heterogeneous group, as noted in Chapters III and IV. This cultural variation does not lend itself to identifying the validity of academic predictors. For example, ratings of the home country academic record may be predictive of U.S. performance for participants from a particular country or area but may be less predictive when participants from a variety of countries are pooled. Subgrouping the participants by country or area can be a better test of the validity of the predictors.

3. Differential Validity of the SAT. The validity of the SAT scores may also be related to several other factors for which some correction may be made.

a. The number of years the participant has been out of school may affect his ability to deal with some of the verbal and many of the mathematical concepts on the SAT. The sample has been partitioned based on the number of years out of school in order to evaluate this hypothesis.

b. The English proficiency of the participant may affect his ability to deal with some of the mathematical and many of the verbal concepts on the SAT. The sample has been partitioned based on TOEFL scores in order to evaluate this hypothesis.

c. The field of study of the participant may affect the validity of the SAT verbal or math score. The sample has been partitioned based on field of study in order to evaluate this hypothesis.

Each of the above reasons for an expectation of low correlations will be analyzed in the undergraduate tables and comments which follow. To assess whether the sample partitioning results in better prediction, correlations will be compared with the total undergraduate sample using first-year GPA as the criterion.

Controlling for Matching.

To assess the possible effects of matching for institutional selectivity, the undergraduate participants were divided into four subgroups according to selectivity of the institution at which they were placed. Institutional selectivity was measured by the "Estimated Selectivity" index published by Astin.[1] Essentially "Estimated Selectivity" is derived from the ratio of highly able seniors naming a college as their choice to the number in that college's freshman class. Colleges were assigned to a high, high middle, low middle, or low selectivity group so that roughly the same number of participants were in each group. The extent to which this matching process occurs can be inferred from inspecting the average ratings and test scores earned by participants in each of the four college groups. These averages are shown in Table VIII-2.

TABLE VIII-2

MEAN SCORES FOR SELECTIVITY SUBGROUPS

Subgroup	Q-U.S.	SAT-M
High	2.53	428
High middle	2.29	471
Low middle	2.35	444
Low	2.52	412

---

[1] Alexander Astin, Who Goes Where To College, Science Research Associates, Chicago, Illinois, 1965.

Comments:

1. There is no particular relationship between the academic quality of the participant as measured by a rating and a test, and the selectivity of the institution at which he was placed. This may have been due to the fact that a large number of Vietnamese were placed on a contractual group basis.
2. Since there was no evidence of a matching phenomenon, separate correlation analyses for each selectivity group are not reported.

Controlling for Geographic Area.

One geographic area (Africa) and one country (Vietnam) were selected as geographic subgroups for separate correlational analyses. These subgroups should be more culturally homogeneous than undergraduates as a whole, which may enhance the validity of the predictors. Table VIII-3 shows the correlation of each predictor with first-year GPA for participants from Africa, Vietnam, and for the total undergraduate group for comparison.

TABLE VIII-3

CORRELATIONS WITH FIRST-YEAR GPA FOR GEOGRAPHIC SUBGROUPS

PREDICTOR	AFRICA	VIETNAM	TOTAL
Birth Year		.51	.36
Years Out		-.43	-.18
Rank	.15	.22	.16
Q-Home		.34	.31
Q-U.S.		.27	.30
Q-Inst.		.44	.37
ALI/GU		.47	.23
TOEFL	.17	.47	.25
SAT-V	.15	.39	.18
SAT-M	.35	.58	.55
N	116-121	127-227	265-390

Comment. Each predictor variable correlated more highly with first-year GPA in the Vietnamese subgroup than in the African subgroup or the total group. While it is not clear why the Vietnamese subgroup is more predictable, these differences suggest that the usefulness of tests and other variables for predicting performance cannot be assumed to be the same for students from all areas of the world. It is likely that validity will vary somewhat from country to country.

Controlling for Years Out of School.

The undergraduate sample was divided into two subgroups. Those who had been out of school for less than three years and those who had been out for three years or more. (Three years most closely divided the participants into equal halves.)

Table VIII-4 shows the correlations of each predictor with first-year GPA for these two subgroups and for the total undergraduate group for comparison.

TABLE VIII-4

CORRELATIONS WITH FIRST-YEAR GPA FOR YEARS OUT OF SCHOOL SUBGROUPS

PREDICTOR	OUT OF SCHOOL < 3 YEARS	OUT OF SCHOOL ≥ 3 YEARS	TOTAL
Birth Year	.38		.36
Years Out	-.25		-.18
Rank	.22		.16
Q-Home	.32		.31
Q-U.S.	.18	.25	.30
Q-Inst.	.49	.26	.37
ALI/GU	.18		.23
TOEFL	.19		.25
SAT-V	.17	.16	.18
SAT-M	.64	.28	.55
N	157-177	94-123	265-390

Comments:

1. The subgroup of participants most recently out of school is clearly the more predictable subgroup. This is particularly true for the SAT-M predictor and it would suggest that the SAT-M score could be used with far greater confidence for a person recently in school.
2. It is interesting that within the group out of school less than three years (a group that averages seven years younger than the other group), age and years out of school are still significant predictors. The participant who is younger and who was more recently in school tends to perform better, even within this subgroup. These two predictors

are not significant in the group out of school three or more years, implying that if one is out of school for awhile, neither the length of time nor one's age is a factor in predicting success.

Controlling for English Proficiency.

The undergraduate sample was divided into four approximately equal subgroups based upon their TOEFL scores. English proficiency should have no bearing on the validity of predictors other than the SAT so Table VIII-5 shows correlations with first-year GPA in the groups only for SAT scores.

TABLE VIII-5

CORRELATIONS WITH FIRST-YEAR GPA FOR ENGLISH PROFICIENCY SUBGROUPS

PREDICTOR	TOEFL TOTAL SCORE				ALL UNDERGRADUATES
	<415	415-479	480-529	≥530	
SAT-V	ns	.23	ns	ns	.18
SAT-M	.46	.57	.49	.57	.55
N	83	62	55	65	265

Comment. No difference was found in the validity of SAT scores for predicting GPA in these several English proficiency groups. In other words, the SAT-Math score is as good a predictor of grades for those with low as those with high TOEFL scores in this sample. Similarly, the SAT-Verbal was not a useful predictor regardless of the level of the TOEFL score.

Controlling for Field of Study.

The undergraduate sample was divided into three subgroups based on major field of study:

1. Biological science, engineering, physical sciences.
2. Business, education, humanities, social sciences.
3. Agriculture, health, home economics.

The differential validity of SAT Math and Verbal in predicting first-year GPA for these curricular groups is shown in Table VIII-6.

TABLE VIII-6

	FIELD OF STUDY			
PREDICTOR	ENGR & SCI	ED-SOC SCI	AG-HLTH	TOTAL
SAT-V	ns	.20	ns	.18
SAT-M	.76	.40	.29	.55
N	76	144	45	265

Comments:

1. SAT-Math is a significantly better predictor of grades for participants in scientific and engineering curriculums than for participants in other curriculums.
2. SAT Verbal does not predict GPA well enough in any curricular group to be of practical value.

Multiple Correlation.

A stepwise multiple regression analysis was run on the total undergraduate group using all ten predictors. The multiple R using all ten predictors was .62. The R using the three best predictors, SAT-Math, Q-Inst. and Birth Year, was .61. This correlation compares favorably with multiple correlations typically found among domestic undergraduate students.

Graduate Sample.

Table VIII-7 shows the correlations between each predictor and each criterion for all graduate students. As before, correlations not statistically significant at the .05 level are not shown.

TABLE VIII-7

CORRELATION MATRIX--ALL GRADUATES

	CRITERIA							
PREDICTORS	GPA-1	AI-1	GPA-2	GPA-Y	AI-Y	CRED.	GR-FS	GR-ALL
Birth Year		-.17			.20	.19		
Years Out	-.12	-.15			-.19	-.16	.16	.17
Rank	.11			.11	.13			
Q-Home								
Q-U.S.								
Q-Inst.	.13	.22	.21	.26	.22	.12	.29	.34
ALI/GU	.11	.29	.13	.14	.30	.30		
TOEFL	.14	.31	.19	.19	.33	.32	.20	.18
GRE-V		.16			.17	.16	.19	.19
GRE-Q		.17		.11	.19	.14	.18	.18
N	396-455	425-523	385-475	390-483	414-510	414-510	365-436	365-436

Comments:

1. Overall the graduate students are much less predictable than the undergraduates. The number of significant correlations is less and the level of the significant correlations is lower.
2. Only the two English tests and the institutional rating of the participant's quality consistently yielded significant relationships with each criterion. Although statistically significant, the magnitude of these relationships is too small to be of any practical value in predicting success for an individual participant.
3. As was true with undergraduates, second-semester GPA is not a more predictable criterion. Unlike the undergraduates, however, first-year GPA was not more validly predicted.
4. As was true with undergraduates, the Achievement Index did not, except when English tests were used as predictors, consistently yield higher correlations.

5. Using faculty ratings as the criterion did enhance the prediction of success--correlations were about the same as with GPA.

The several reasons listed in the undergraduate section for expecting low correlations can be applied equally to the graduate group. Separate correlation matrices were run for four geographic subgroups, two differential "Years Out" subgroups, two English proficiency subgroups and three curricular subgroups each using first-year GPA as the criterion. It was decided not to partition the sample in terms of selectivity of the graduate school since no comparable selectivity measure was readily available and because of the absence of matching found in the undergraduate sample.

In none of the subgrouping procedures was there any evidence of improved prediction. The low level of correlations involved may be seen from Table VIII-8 which shows (without regard to sign) the lowest, median, and highest correlation for each of the subgroups mentioned above.

TABLE VIII-8

LOWEST, MEDIAN AND HIGHEST CORRELATION OF ALL PREDICTORS WITH FIRST-YEAR GPA WITHIN SEVERAL GRADUATE SUBGROUPS

	CORRELATION WITH FIRST-YEAR GPA		
GROUP	LOWEST r	MEDIAN r	HIGHEST r
Total Group	.03	.11	.26
Africa	.01	.06	.23
Far East	.01	.10	.22
Latin America	.04	.18	.30
NESA	.03	.20	.37
Out of school <3 years	.00	.08	.30
Out of school >3 years	.02	.06	.25
TOEFL >475	.04	.09	.24
TOEFL <475	.01	.10	.26
Engr-Science	.02	.16	.36
Educ-Soc. Sci.	.01	.11	.27
Agric.-Health	.01	.10	.18

The lack of useful predictors is even more apparent by noting that in all but two cases, the highest correlation in each subgroup involved the institutional rating of the participant, a rating not available during the selection and placement process.

A stepwise multiple regression analysis using all ten predictors was run for graduate students with first-year GPA as the criterion. The multiple R using all predictors was .34.

Summary and Conclusions.

1. The SAT-Math was a surprisingly good predictor of undergraduate performance. Its relationship with grades was higher than that typically found with U.S. students, particularly among participants recently in school and in math-science curriculums. It even predicted well when English proficiency was below average. Verbal scores on U.S. aptitude tests (SAT or GRE) were of little predictive value.

2. English proficiency tests consistently had significant correlations with performance especially when the performance measure included the amount of credit completed. Used alone, however, the usefulness of ALI/GU or TOEFL in predicting grades was limited. Since participants with lower scores tended to receive more English training in the U.S., they may well have caught up with higher scoring participants by the end of the first year; thus reducing the predictive value of their original scores.

3. Among the ratings of the quality of the participant's record, the rating made on the campus was, as expected, the most predictive of success. The ratings made by AACRAO credential analysts correlated somewhat with the performance of the undergraduates but not with the performance of

the graduates. To the extent the analysts' ratings were used in the process of placing the participant, the overall level of performance, rather than the predictability of the performance, is the better criterion in judging the usefulness of these ratings. Descriptions of the participants' performance were presented in Chapter VII.

4. Age and the number of years out of school had some relationship with grades. Younger participants and those just out of school tended to perform better within this mature group.

5. With respect to graduate students, no predictors of practical value were identified. This finding is not an uncommon one among U.S. graduate students.

6. Rank in class, as reported by the participant, was virtually useless as a predictor.

7. There seemed to be little evidence of systematic matching of participant quality with the selectivity in admission standards of the institution at the undergraduate level.

8. Despite attempts to develop criteria other than GPA which would enhance the predictive value of preadmission variables, correlations were as high or higher with GPA as with any other criterion measure. Second-semester GPA was not more predictable than first-semester GPA.

CHAPTER IX
SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Descriptions of people and analyses of their behavior by statistical procedures usually illuminate conventional wisdom rather than reveal unimagined truths. So it is with this Study. Nevertheless, the results of the Study do shed considerable light on the question of how to improve "the procedures and guidelines which will enable the USAID Missions overseas, AID in Washington (AID/OIT), and U.S. universities and colleges to carry out their individual responsibilities for the selection and placement of participants most efficiently and successfully." In this final chapter, an attempt will be made to interpret from the mass of the data presented what the Study Committee perceives to be of particular significance for AID, for U.S. colleges and universities, and for the field of international educational exchanges generally. This will be done in the form of observations and, where pertinent, recommendations, in relation to the central questions from each of three viewpoints.

The reader is reminded, once again, that these observations and recommendations are generalizations based upon the data for the Study sample and the period of time during which the data were collected. The Study Committee has not attempted to ascertain whether any of these generalizations have pertinence with respect to the present AID participant population and practices.

Study Outcomes--the Participant and What He Accomplished.

Did the AID training program select the right participants for academic training? Did they come adequately prepared for the training tasks (program) intended for them? Were their expectations with respect to program congruent with those of AID? Were the participants doing the job? How well did they succeed? These were the central questions regarding the selection and the performance of participants, and they are the critical "pay-off" questions for AID.

In general the answers to these questions to be found in the data of the Study were reassuringly affirmative. Relevant observations based on the Study are:

1. Most participants were requested to consider training abroad--most were not self-nominated originally.
2. Their selection--as both they and the agency perceive it--was not made primarily upon the quality of their previous academic experience but rather on their potential for doing a job needed in the country.
3. Notwithstanding, they appeared in general to be a better-than-average group of foreign students; this is the more remarkable since they had, on the average, been away from formal education longer than other students typically, and time away from education tends (the data show) to affect academic performance negatively.
4. About nine in ten of the participants were judged by experienced evaluators (off-campus) to be likely to perform satisfactorily in a typical college or university and in fact only 7.5% were placed on academic probation during their first year. They were, in brief, in most cases prepared for the program of study intended.
5. The vast majority (over 85%) met their degree or training objective, a notable achievement, even though a substantial number were judged by campus representatives to have marginal or inadequate records for admissions purposes. It is possible that the participant's motivation, the explicitness of his objective, and the kind of agency support he received may explain performance superior to what might be expected from his records.

6. Not only were training objectives met successfully, but the level of performance of participants, as measured by grades and faculty ratings, was above average.

7. Over one-third of these academic participants appear to have expected a different field of study from the one planned for them in their PIO/P's. Some of this difference is undoubtedly accounted for by differences in terminology and classification of the several fields of study. However, the evidence suggests that closer attention might be paid to communication and understanding among the participant, AID, and the institution in the designation of fields of study. Such understanding and agreement can be crucial to the participant's morale and satisfaction with the program, as well as to the ultimate benefits from the program in the participant's home country.

Study Outcomes--Assessment of Tests and the Prediction Potential.

Granted that selection and performance of participants were qualitatively good, the question remains: Were the operational standards in the process as good as they might be? Do the Study data have anything to say to AID management on techniques and procedures? What is at stake here for AID is not only its central objective from the standpoint of country development but also the quality of its relationships with the participants and with U.S. colleges and universities. A participant who finds himself faced with an unanticipated long interval of English language training before he can get started in his training objective, or a U.S. institution encumbered frequently with incomplete participant dossiers from AID, may as a result be frustrated--with adverse consequences for the program over a more extended period of time.

A foremost concern in undertaking the Study was whether tests and other information relevant to selection would be useful to improve the quality of selection and perhaps placement. In other words, could such a study show that certain information, including test scores, has a power of prediction with respect to success in colleges and universities such that it might profitably be employed in the AID process?

"Prediction equations" of this nature, it should be noted, have commonly been developed for the domestic undergraduate admissions processes of many selective U.S. colleges and universities. In these instances statistical analyses typically show, as would be expected, a significant positive relationship between the quality of a student's work in high school and in college and that this predictor (high school record) is generally the most powerful one available. However, when the school record is supplemented by the results of an aptitude test such as the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), the predictive power is generally enhanced. For domestic students at the graduate level no comparable procedures for prediction have been in general use, and it is doubtful that useful powers of prediction exist in these terms for the admission of domestic graduate students. This is true largely because graduate students are ordinarily selected from a relatively narrow band of high-achieving students, thus resulting in the attenuation and disappearance of prediction differentials, and also because graduate student degree performance is not necessarily related closely to grade-point achievement.

It should be also noted that where prediction procedures have been used for domestic admissions purposes, their power is never such as to indicate conclusively and automatically who should and who should not be selected. At best they may account for 30-40% of the variance in grade performance at the collegiate undergraduate level. What they can show, with fair reliability in these circumstances, is the range of students whose prospects of success at the institution are dim enough to make the risks of admission unwise for both students and institutions. Test scores and other predictive information, then, are no magical design, as some suppose, for automating selection and admissions decisions in individual cases. They are useful supplementary information for decision-makers when their predictive power can be established.

The criterion for measuring success used by most collegiate authorities and psychometricians is the grade-point average. This unidimensional criterion has been subjected to increasing criticism from both within and outside the university community, since no clearly demonstrable relationship can be shown to exist between academic performance in these terms and later vocational success. In the case of AID participants it is certainly true, one would suppose, that the relative success of two participants who meet requirements and complete their respective training programs on schedule is not differentiated necessarily by grade-point averages.

In the context of these comments about prediction, the following observations with respect to prediction are pertinent as derived from the Study data:

1. While undergraduates were more predictable than graduates with respect to their academic performance, the only substantial, and surprisingly significant, predictor was the mathematics aptitude section of the SAT. (Except for certain selective engineering schools, the SAT-M usually has much less predictive power for U.S. undergraduate applicants than the SAT-V.)
2. Other data (variables) had significant correlations with success measured in these terms and for selection of undergraduates it is important to be aware of such correlations, e.g.: The younger and the more recently in school tended to do better, the quality of the participant's previous academic record was related to success, and English language

scores bore some correspondence to academic performance in general. None of these correlations was such as to warrant defining minimum selection standards on these bases, except for English language proficiency.

3. The Study reveals that scores on the English proficiency tests were not strongly predictive of grade averages to be earned; they have more significance in indicating the academic workload a student will be able to undertake. AID has standards (minimum Call-forward scores) applicable to the participant's language proficiency. If these standards were enforced and were valid, it might logically be inferred that variations in language proficiency would not ordinarily be a cause of academic failure in U.S. institutions. However, language proficiency above the standard could correlate closely with the quality of grade performance or show no appreciable correlation. In fact the Study data show a moderate but not strong correlation here. Undergraduates scoring lower (substandard) in the ALI/GU test tend to have lower quality academic records in the U.S., but even with the substandard cases there are no failures to meet objectives that are directly attributable to language problems.

Study Outcomes--Some Particular Points for the Attention of Management.

Apart from the question of tests and predictors, does the Study have anything to say to the AID management with respect to internal procedures? These additional observations may be pertinent to this question:

1. The Credential Analysts Worksheet (CAW), refined in the course of this Study as a study tool and an operational device, has since proved to be widely useful as a means for organizing and evaluating data concerning a foreign student. Its systematic use by AID presents an opportunity for continuously refining experience and improving the

quality of the critical judgments made about participants in AID/Washington.

2. Within AID critical judgments about participants are being made by Mission personnel, the Development Training Specialist (DTS) and the Academic Advisory Staff. Among them they indicate what program, level, and institutions or types of institutions would be appropriate for the participant. In the nature of the procedure and the function of the three AID parties to the program and placement process, one might expect that the initial judgment of the Mission would be primary with respect to program, that the AAS would be most knowledgeable with respect to placement, and that the DTS, with final responsibility for the training arrangements, would modify these judgments only as operational requirements might necessitate. In about three-fifths of the cases the actual placement coincided with the Mission recommendation on institutional placement and in about two-fifths of the cases with that of the Academic Advisory Staff. It should be noted that while the data base for these observations involved only about one-third of the total Study sample, questions nevertheless arise as to whether the expertise of the Academic Advisory Staff was being fully utilized, and what other factors enter into the final placement decision.

3. In about a quarter of all AID Mission submissions of participants' records transmitted by AID/W to institutions, important documents were missing from the dossier. The data show that this problem varies appreciably in its extent among the individual Missions sponsoring the participants. Occasional submission of incomplete dossiers can be justified by special circumstances, but the rate at which such submissions happened in the Study sample cannot easily be defended. An unnecessary burden upon both AID/W and, especially, the institutions is a consequence.

This suggests that existing AID Manual Orders and procedures should be reviewed to assure submission of adequate academic dossiers.

4. The Study makes a number of points relevant for management and its concern for English proficiency. Among the more notable are:

a. TOEFL and ALI/GU appear to measure approximately the same thing in terms of language proficiency and can be related in terms of score scales for useful operational purposes. (An important distinction between the two tests is that TOEFL is administered under standard conditions of security and supervision, whereas ALI/GU (overseas) is not. This distinction is more important for those concerned with competitive conditions of scholarship and admission than it is to AID. However AID perforce must generally meet the individual university's requirements, and TOEFL is the test generally required by institutions.)

b. About two-fifths of the academic participants in the Study were "called forward" with test scores below stated AID minimums. However, most of them were for participants who were to receive full-time ELI or campus training. Of those who should have received such special training, less than one-fourth actually did. Plainly, the stated AID standards in this report appear to be honored more in the breach. The Study Committee is aware that to some extent such exceptions were for valid operational reasons.

c. Participants from two countries (India and Pakistan) for which English proficiency testing waivers are given showed generally inadequate proficiency. The data raise questions about the policy of extending such waivers to these two countries.

5. Although the great majority of the academic participants in the sample clearly met the training objectives established, 7% of them failed to receive the degree planned for them, about 4% had new degree objectives approved (which they realized), and some few received degrees when they had no degree objectives. These presumed slippages in program performance should be studied in further detail for insights with respect to the problem of quality control. The record is good, but it presumably can be improved.

Recommendations for AID.

The information about academic participants that has been amassed in this Study presents an opportunity for evaluation and interpretation by AID management. The significance and usefulness of the information can in many respects be best determined by program management itself. The recommendations which follow stem from observations made in the foregoing part of this chapter:

1. In the selection, briefing, and counseling process overseas, Mission personnel should assure that the participant and the Mission are in full understanding and agreement about the field and degree objectives constituting the participant's program. The Study suggests that the procedures for such understanding and agreement may need to be strengthened.

2. All AID personnel responsible for participant selection and placement should be informed about the relationship (correlations) between certain participant characteristics and academic success in U.S. institutions. However, the Study results do not point conclusively to the desirability of introducing new tests in the AID selection and placement process as an operating routine; nevertheless the SAT-Math might well prove useful in a competitive selection situation.

3. The relationship between those making institutional placement of participants (the Development Training Specialists and participating agencies) and the Academic Advisory Staff should be reexamined to assure maximum effective use of the output of the latter.

4. Steps should be taken to reduce substantially the proportion of incomplete credential submissions by AID Mission through AID/W to U.S. institutions.

5. AID minimum language proficiency standards should be reexamined to ascertain whether uniform and absolute minimum score requirements represent best application of standards. English proficiency standards are necessary, but they can, perhaps, be more flexibly described. Once they are defined, they should be enforced.

6. Where supplementary English training is indicated, AID should see that provision of such training is built into the participant's program. Too often that was not done for those in the Study sample.

7. English proficiency testing waivers for participants from India and Pakistan should be discontinued.

8. The relatively small number of problem cases in the Study sample, i.e., those who did not complete their original objective, should be studied on a case-by-case basis to discover whether there might be management remedies available to avert such outcomes in the future.

9. The evaluative techniques applied in the Study should be examined by AID to ascertain what might be usefully adapted as a part of AID's regular procedures, e.g., the use of the CAW or the use of performance reports from the universities. The Study Committee does not recommend the installation of academic aptitude testing as a part of such regular procedures.

10. The participants in the Study should be followed up to see how their selection, placement, performance, and appropriateness of training relate to what they do after their return. The final evaluation of success in terms of program objectives cannot otherwise be ascertained. The cooperation of AACRAO, the universities, and perhaps other organizations might be sought for this purpose.

Study Outcomes as Seen from an Institutional Viewpoint.

The AACRAO-AID Study Committee does not presume to evaluate the outcomes of the Study from the viewpoint of U.S. colleges and universities and the international educational exchange field generally. Such judgments are better left to the critical discussion and review of those concerned. The following general observations may, however, be pertinent with respect to the institutional viewpoint:

1. The participants have generally fitted well into their respective U.S. institutions, performed ably, and presumably made a contribution to institutional purposes in these terms.
2. Although older and more diverse in their background than U.S. students, AID participants apparently accommodated successfully to U.S. institutions (and vice versa): the usefulness and flexibility of U.S. institutions for such purposes were well displayed.
3. Institutional flexibility was evident, particularly, in their acceptance of participants without complete credentials; nevertheless, relationships with institutions would undoubtedly be easier without the need for this particular kind of flexing.
4. The Study furnishes no evidence to show that institutions have common practices or policies with respect to English language requirements for students as they differ in their TOEFL score levels.

5. The practices of AID with respect to institutional placement suggest that the best interests of the program might be better assisted by the diverse resources of U.S. higher education if, for example, more institutions than are now being used might be tapped for participant placement. AACRAO will continue to cooperate with AID toward this end.

Study Outcomes from the Viewpoint of International Educational Exchanges.

With the same disclaimers as in the previous section, the Study Committee makes these observations:

1. AID participant training is the largest sponsored program in international educational exchange; as such it is highly influential and presents a special opportunity for development of effective program management practices.

2. AID should make its experience and its procedures known to other exchange program sponsors insofar as the experience and procedures would be of general interest and application; this should be a matter of routine and not confined to the results of this AACRAO-AID Study.

3. The AID participant population is importantly different in makeup from the general population of foreign students in the U.S.; it may nevertheless be instructive to note for further consideration that:

   a. The participant record of coming to the U.S. and satisfactorily completing his program appears to be distinctly better than that of foreign students generally. (What are the factors which might explain the difference?)

   b. After about three years away from formal academic study, the number of "years away" seem to have no appreciable effect upon academic performance in the Study sample. (Is this true for foreign students generally? For U.S. students?)

c. Participants with English proficiency scores below AID standards and often without the prescribed language instruction generally completed their program--though the undergraduates had slightly lower academic achievement. (Is there a tendency to peg too arbitrary standards for English proficiency for foreign students?)

d. Tests of verbal aptitude in English seemed to have little predictive value for participants even at the undergraduate level. (This appears to support the miscellaneous research on the point done for foreign students generally.) More surprisingly, such tests did not seem to be more effective for prediction even when "moderated" by English proficiency scores.

e. Tests of math aptitude, it would appear, could provide useful predictive information, at least for undergraduate admissions or for certain types of academic programs.

Epilogue.

It must be apparent to the reader of this Study, as it is to the Committee, that the 1004 individuals constituting the sample were of remarkable diversity and as a group resisted generalizations or explanations concerning their academic behavior. In the management of such survey enterprises wisdom begins with recognition that the process of educating human beings involves a set of interactions that cannot be comprehended wholly or, sometimes, at all in terms of quantity and classification. At best, studies and analyses in these terms provide clues for understanding and insights. Clearly, more important than formal "procedures" and "standards" are the attitudes and the skills in human relationships of those having a part to play in the training program.

Indeed, so complex is the process of selection and placement--and so hazardous the prediction of success or failure in matters of education--that there will never be an adequate substitute for the thoughtful application of knowledge of our own and other systems by human intelligence, however sophisticated the aids to the exercise of that well-informed intelligence become through studies such as this one.

The reader may well ponder, with some humility, his own staggering ignorance in the face of the vast diversity of practices and standards just among our own domestic institutions of higher education, not to mention the variety within any specific institution, such as our "multiuniversities." Let him further assess the rapid changes taking place all about us in our educational system as they affect both structure and substance, e.g., the validity of grading systems, to mention only one example. The variables are truly fantastic. Then let him contemplate the same accelerated change of our times in education throughout the whole world! Finally, our new appreciation of the complexity of the individual will enrich his sense of learned ignorance. Unfortunately, it may suggest the folly of the entire endeavor to try to establish criteria for reasonably successful selection of students. And yet folly it is not. The work goes on. Research studies furnish the guides and norms. Intelligence and experience, often by trial and error, together provide and improve the best possible answers.

For what does it profit a dean or an admissions officer if he has a calculus of probabilities ready at hand, but little feel for or experience with the living being who presents himself, so impersonally, from so far away, as an expectant foreign student? Some of these persons will, we hope, materialize in the pages which follow as Appendix A.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ACRONYMS

AACRAO	American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers
AAS or AAS/W	Academic Advisory Staff, Office of International Training, AID
AID	Agency for International Development, Department of State
AID/OIT	AID, Office of International Training
ALI/GU	American Language Institute, Georgetown University--provides English language training and materials development, including tests, for AID-sponsored participants (students) and grantees of CU (Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State)
BIO-DATA	Participant Biographical Data form (see Appendix C)
Call Forward	Authority for the Mission to send a participant to the U.S. for his training program
CAW	Credential Analyst Worksheet. A special form used by AACRAO and AAS professional credential analysts to record the factual and qualitative data and judgments about a participant's educational background and preparation related to his proposed academic training program in the U.S. (see Appendix D)
CPQ	Campus Participant Questionnaire (see Appendix F)
Dossier	Participant's file of documents, including academic record, used in placing him in his training program in the U.S.
DTS	Development Training Specialist
GPA	Grade-point average
GRE	Graduate Record Examination
Mission	AID representatives overseas
OIT	Office of International Training, AID
PA	Participating federal agencies, in Washington, D.C.
Participant	A foreign national selected jointly by Mission and host country personnel for training connected with the AID-assisted development program in his country
PIO/P	Project Implementation Order/Participants (see Appendix B)
SAT	Scholastic Aptitude Test, provided by the College Entrance Examination Board
TOEFL	Test of English as a Foreign Language, provided by the College Entrance Examination Board and Educational Testing Service
USAID	AID Mission overseas

LIST OF TABLES

Explanation: Roman numerals are Chapter numbers; Arabic numbers are table numbers within chapters.

III - 1 PARTICIPANTS' HOME COUNTRIES

2 GEOGRAPHIC ORIGIN OF AID PARTICIPANTS AND ALL FOREIGN STUDENTS IN THE U.S.

3 PLACEMENT LEVEL AND GEOGRAPHIC AREA OF PARTICIPANTS

4 SEX AND MARITAL STATUS OF PARTICIPANTS

5 AGE OF PARTICIPANTS

6 YEARS SINCE PARTICIPANTS' LAST SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

7 PRESENT AND FUTURE OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES OF PARTICIPANTS

8 FUTURE EMPLOYER OF PARTICIPANTS

9 PARTICIPANTS' MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY

10 PARTICIPANTS' DEGREE OBJECTIVE

11 EXTENT TO WHICH PARTICIPANTS WERE ASKED TO APPLY FOR THE AID ACADEMIC TRAINING PROGRAM

12 EXTENT TO WHICH PARTICIPANTS IN 14 COUNTRIES WITH 15 OR MORE PARTICIPANTS WERE ASKED TO APPLY FOR THE AID ACADEMIC TRAINING PROGRAM

13 PARTICIPANTS' RATINGS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF CERTAIN QUALIFICATIONS IN THEIR BEING ACCEPTED FOR THE AID ACADEMIC TRAINING PROGRAM

14 PARTICIPANTS' RATINGS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF CERTAIN BENEFITS FROM EDUCATION IN THE U.S.

IV - 1 TYPE OF SECONDARY SCHOOL ATTENDED BY UNDERGRADUATES

2 YEARS OF ELEMENTARY/SECONDARY TRAINING

3 ADMISSIBILITY TO UNIVERSITY IN THE PARTICIPANT'S HOME COUNTRY

4 ADMISSIBILITY TO UNIVERSITY IN THE PARTICIPANT'S HOME COUNTRY: BY COUNTRY

5 HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED

6 APPROPRIATENESS OF PREVIOUS COURSE WORK

List of Tables 2

IV - 7 QUALITY OF PREVIOUS ACADEMIC RECORD

8 ESTIMATED RANK IN CLASS

9 TYPE OF U.S. INSTITUTION IN WHICH PARTICIPANTS COULD DO SATISFACTORY WORK

10 SAT VERBAL SCORE DISTRIBUTION

11 SAT MATHEMATICS SCORE DISTRIBUTION

12 GRE VERBAL SCORE DISTRIBUTION

13 GRE QUANTITATIVE SCORE DISTRIBUTION

14 MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF GRE SCORES OF GRADUATE-LEVEL PARTICIPANTS COMPARED WITH A SAMPLE OF OTHER FOREIGN STUDENTS

V - 1 FIELDS OF STUDY PARTICIPANTS EXPECTED TO STUDY IN THE U.S.

2 COMPARISON OF FIELDS OF STUDY EXPECTED BY PARTICIPANTS WITH THE MAJORS SCHEDULED FOR THEM ON THEIR PIO/P's

3 MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY FOLLOWED BY PARTICIPANTS IN U.S. UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

4 COMPARISON OF EDUCATIONAL MAJORS PRESCRIBED FOR PARTICIPANTS IN THEIR TRAINING PROGRAMS (PIO/P's) WITH THE MAJOR FIELDS OF STUDY THEY FOLLOWED IN U.S. UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

5 COMPARISON OF EDUCATIONAL STARTING LEVELS OF PARTICIPANTS AS JUDGED BY THE PARTICIPANTS AND BY CREDENTIAL ANALYSTS

6 COMPARISON OF EDUCATIONAL STARTING LEVELS OF PARTICIPANTS AS JUDGED BY CREDENTIAL ANALYSTS AND THE ACTUAL LEVELS REPORTED BY CAMPUS REPRESENTATIVES

7 PARTICIPANTS' DEGREE OBJECTIVES STATED IN THEIR PIO/P's COMPARED WITH THE HIGHEST DEGREES THEY EXPECTED TO EARN

8 COMPARISON OF DEGREE OBJECTIVES AS JUDGED BY CREDENTIAL ANALYSTS AND AS REPORTED BY CAMPUS REPRESENTATIVES

9 COMPLETENESS OF PARTICIPANTS' EDUCATIONAL CREDENTIALS AND DOCUMENTS AS JUDGED BY ANALYSTS IN WASHINGTON

10 SELECTED COUNTRIES WHOSE PARTICIPANTS' DOSSIERS LACKED SOME ADMISSIONS CREDENTIALS

11 COMPLETENESS OF PARTICIPANTS' ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS FOR ADMISSION TO U.S. UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

12 ACTIONS TAKEN BY CAMPUS ADMISSIONS OFFICERS WHEN CREDENTIALS WERE LACKING

V - 13 TYPES OF ADMISSION GRANTED BY U.S. UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

14 PARTICIPANTS WHO WERE GIVEN FORMAL PLACEMENT TESTS BY THE U.S. INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH THEY ENROLLED

15 PARTICIPANTS GRANTED TRANSFER CREDITS BY U.S. INSTITUTIONS

16 EXTENT TO WHICH MISSION PLACEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS WERE FOLLOWED

17 EXTENT TO WHICH AAS/W PLACEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS WERE FOLLOWED

VI - 1 OFFICIAL COUNTRY LANGUAGE OF PARTICIPANTS

2 LANGUAGE SPOKEN IN HOME, SECONDARY SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY

3 YEARS OF ENGLISH STUDY IN SCHOOL WHERE ENGLISH IS NOT LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION

4 MEAN TOEFL SCORES FOR AID PARTICIPANTS AND FOR ALL FOREIGN APPLICANTS TESTED BETWEEN 1964 AND 1967

5 DISTRIBUTION OF AID PARTICIPANTS ON TOEFL ACCORDING TO ETS GUIDELINES

6 DISTRIBUTION OF TOEFL SCORES FOR PARTICIPANTS ACCORDING TO SELF-RATING ON ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

7 DISTRIBUTION OF OVERSEAS ALI/GU SCORES

8 NUMBERS OF AID PARTICIPANTS ACHIEVING VARIOUS ALI/GU TEST-SCORE THRESHOLDS OVERSEAS

9 DISTRIBUTION OF U.S. ALI/GU SCORES

10 NUMBERS OF AID PARTICIPANTS ACHIEVING VARIOUS ALI/GU TEST-SCORE THRESHOLDS IN THE U.S.

11 EXTENT TO WHICH ALI/GU SCORES WERE BELOW ESTABLISHED THRESHOLDS FOR PARTICIPANTS WHO DID NOT ATTEND ALI/GU

12 EXTENT TO WHICH ALI/GU SCORES WERE BELOW ESTABLISHED THRESHOLDS FOR PARTICIPANTS WHO ATTENDED ALI/GU

13 TOEFL SCORE RANGES AND BEST PREDICTION OF TOEFL TOTAL SCORES COMPUTED FROM VARIOUS ALI/GU TOTAL SCORES

14 ALI/GU TOEFL TOTAL SCORE EXPECTANCY TABLE

15 DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS WHO MET VARIOUS AID MINIMUM ALI/GU TEST SCORE THRESHOLDS AND THEIR PLACEMENT OUTCOMES, BASED ON FOUR ALI/GU TESTS TAKEN OVERSEAS

VI - 16 DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS WHO MET VARIOUS AID MINIMUM ALI/GU TEST THRESHOLDS AND THEIR PLACEMENT OUTCOMES, BASED ON THREE ALI/GU TESTS TAKEN OVERSEAS

17 DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS WHO MET VARIOUS AID MINIMUM ALI/GU TEST SCORE THRESHOLDS AND THEIR PLACEMENT OUTCOMES, BASED ON ALI/GU TESTS TAKEN UPON ARRIVAL IN THE U.S.

18 MEAN SCORES EARNED ON THE ALI/GU TESTS BY 479 PARTICIPANTS OVERSEAS AND UPON ARRIVAL IN THE U.S., AND THE CORRELATION BETWEEN THESE SCORES

19 DISTRIBUTION OF AID PARTICIPANTS HAVING ENGLISH WAIVERS FROM VARIOUS COUNTRIES IN TERMS OF WHETHER THEY MET ALL THREE SCORE REQUIREMENTS FOR IMMEDIATE CALL-FORWARD AND COLLEGE PLACEMENT (USAGE-80, VOCABULARY-READING-65, LISTENING-65)

20 TOEFL SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WITH INDIVIDUAL ENGLISH TEST WAIVERS

21 EXTENT OF FULL-TIME ENGLISH STUDY PRIOR TO ACADEMIC ENROLLMENT

22 DURATION OF FULL-TIME ENGLISH TRAINING IN THE U.S.

23 ALI/GU SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS WITH VARIOUS AMOUNTS OF FULL-TIME ENGLISH STUDY

24 PREPARATORY ENGLISH ON CAMPUS

25 AMOUNT OF PREPARATORY WORK IN ENGLISH ON CAMPUS

26 ENGLISH REQUIRED ON CAMPUS ACCORDING TO U.S. ALI/GU SCORES

27 MEDIAN FIRST-YEAR GPA ACCORDING TO U.S. ALI/GU SCORES

28 MEDIAN CREDITS EARNED IN FIRST YEAR ACCORDING TO U.S. ALI/GU SCORES

VII - 1 FIRST AND SECOND-TERM CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED AND EARNED BY UNDERGRADUATE PARTICIPANTS

2 FIRST-YEAR CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED AND EARNED BY UNDERGRADUATE PARTICIPANTS

3 FIRST AND SECOND-TERM GPA DISTRIBUTIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATES

4 FIRST AND SECOND-YEAR GPA DISTRIBUTIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATES

5 FIRST AND SECOND-TERM CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED AND EARNED BY GRADUATE PARTICIPANTS

6 FIRST-YEAR CREDIT HOURS ATTEMPTED AND EARNED BY GRADUATE PARTICIPANTS

7 NUMBER OF MONTHS OF ACADEMIC STUDY REQUIRED FOR ATTAINMENT OF THE MASTER'S DEGREE

VII - 8 NUMBER OF CALENDAR MONTHS REQUIRED FOR ATTAINMENT OF THE MASTER'S DEGREE

9 FIRST AND SECOND-TERM GPA DISTRIBUTIONS FOR GRADUATE PARTICIPANTS

10 FIRST AND SECOND-YEAR GPA DISTRIBUTIONS FOR GRADUATE PARTICIPANTS

11 FACULTY RATINGS OF GRADUATE PARTICIPANTS' ACADEMIC WORK RELATIVE TO THE PERFORMANCE OF OTHER STUDENTS IN THE SAME PROGRAM

12 FACULTY RATINGS OF GRADUATE PARTICIPANTS' ACADEMIC WORK RELATIVE TO THE PERFORMANCE OF OTHER FOREIGN STUDENTS IN THE SAME PROGRAM

13 EXTENT TO WHICH PARTICIPANTS WERE PLACED ON ACADEMIC PROBATION

14 EXTENT TO WHICH PARTICIPANTS COMPLETED THEIR DEGREE AND TRAINING OBJECTIVES

VIII - 1 CORRELATION MATRIX--ALL UNDERGRADUATES

2 MEAN SCORES FOR SELECTIVITY SUBGROUPS

3 CORRELATIONS WITH FIRST-YEAR GPA FOR GEOGRAPHIC SUBGROUPS

4 CORRELATIONS WITH FIRST-YEAR GPA FOR YEARS OUT OF SCHOOL SUBGROUPS

5 CORRELATIONS WITH FIRST-YEAR GPA FOR ENGLISH PROFICIENCY SUBGROUPS

6 FIELD OF STUDY

7 CORRELATION MATRIX--ALL GRADUATES

8 LOWEST, MEDIAN AND HIGHEST CORRELATION OF ALL PREDICTORS WITH FIRST-YEAR GPA WITHIN SEVERAL GRADUATE SUBGROUPS

CASE DESCRIPTIONS

The case descriptions which follow were selected from among those participants in this Study whose records were completed earliest. The selection was not random, even though the cases chosen reflect some of the characteristics of that type of sampling.

A rapid review of many cases by several minds was made to find interesting ones. The definition of "interesting" ranges all the way from the ideal of the perfectly chosen, properly placed, solidly performing student to the poorly chosen, ineptly placed, miserably performing student. Between the two extremes all sorts of questions are suggested from a close reading of the descriptions. Who gets the credit for the success stories? To whom shall we assign the blame for the failures? Actually, as in all human situations, the answers are wrong if they are too facile.

The descriptions have been kept as faithful to the available facts as the absence of identification permits, and they are presented in as reportorial a fashion as possible. It is hoped that the few personal intrusions of the reporter may be forgiven. The descriptions are not intended to point a finger, to read a lesson, or to say "I told you so". They are intended primarily to invite contemplation of the many questions which spring up spontaneously as one reads the raw case materials of each selection. They could have been done for many more because each participant in this Study, as in all others about human beings, is unique. Hopefully the few descriptions that follow will clothe with flesh and blood and breathe life into the skeleton of averages and standard deviations which of necessity characterize this kind of study.

APPENDIX A-2

1. Mr. ____, age 22, came to this country to earn a Master's degree in Economics to return in a teaching capacity at the university where he had received his undergraduate degree. His experience after graduation was limited to some years as an assistant doing research and some instruction of students in Economics.

He had been the top student in his class, receiving his Bachelor of Arts degree in Economics with great distinction. His record shows him to have had a final average in the high eighties with particular strength in Economics but middling results in Mathematics at the level of college Algebra and Mathematics for Economists, Statistical Methods, and Applied Economic Statistics. Those reviewing his records prior to placement at a university in this country felt that he had an appropriate background and that he was a superior student in terms of the records of other persons in his educational system.

In overseas testing he had an ALI/GU score of 289. When he was tested in Washington on arrival he scored 290. His TOEFL score was 642; his GRE verbal was 520 and his mathematics was 510.

Although English was not the language of his country or in his home, it was the language of the secondary school and the university. He felt that his command of English was sufficiently good to program full-time studies. He estimated that he was in the upper ten percent of his graduating group of 16 students and that his subject matter preparation was adequate to begin the graduate program for the Master's degree in Economics. He stated that he felt his academic record was very important in his having been selected for studies in this country and that his job and English competency were of some importance in the selection process. He felt that the benefits of his educational experience here would be to advance his career, his country, and his personal development.

The university which received him placed him as a regular graduate student in the Master's program without deficiencies and considered him above average in terms of the record required for admissions to their programs. His record requires little comment. It can be summarized by stating that he received grades of A in three courses in Economics and of B in three other courses in Economics, including one in Statistics. The remainder of his studies are accounted for by thesis research. He completed the Master's degree in two semesters and a summer session.

His academic advisor rated him above average of all of the students in the graduate program and superior in terms of other foreign students. He made the comment that the student had superior capacity and was hard working and that he was the only foreign student in several years to complete his thesis and studies in the minimum time. The committee examining him was unanimous in recommending that he be encouraged to go on to follow studies for the Doctor's degree. An explanation is given that such a recommendation is made in only about one of five cases and that in the screening of persons receiving the Master's degree most students receive no comment or simply a statement that they may go on toward the Doctor's degree if they wish to do so.

2. Mr. ____, age 35, came to this country to earn a Master's degree to return home to teach Agricultural Economics at the college level. He had gone to the university as a somewhat older student after teaching for some ten years and upon graduation he was working for the government in various capacities where his undergraduate studies in Agricultural Economics would be of the greatest value. Those reviewing his records before he came to this country considered him to be an above-average student who had a somewhat appropriate background. He had predominantly grades of B in his major and quite strong recommendations from two of his teachers.

On arrival he scored 650 in the TOEFL examinations; and in the GRE he scored 440 in the verbal, and 530 in the mathematics section.

The institution which received him placed him directly as a student without deficiencies in the Master of Science program. He was retested in English and no remedial work was required of him. We know that English was not his mother tongue but that it was the language of instruction in the secondary schools and universities. Further information about him is lacking because he did not complete all of the questionnaire. He was, however, considered average in his studies as an undergraduate in his home country and in terms of the admissions standards of the receiving institution.

In his first semester he scheduled nine credits of substantial subject matter in Economics and Agricultural Economics and made grades of B, C, and D in each of the three courses. Then in the following spring he failed in an undergraduate Algebra and Trigonometry course and in a three-credit course in Agricultural Economics but he made an A in another course in that field. He received a C in an Introduction to Statistical Methods. He apparently took no additional work at that institution. The academic advisor rated him as inadequate in terms of all other graduate students and marginal in terms of other foreign students within the experience of the department.

In the following fall semester he registered at another institution as a graduate special student with the distinct understanding that he was not in a degree status and was free to enroll in such courses as he desired. The comment from that institution is that no one was particularly concerned about his program or about his objective. In the fall semester his record shows a withdrawal from a college Algebra course, a failure in what appears to be a strictly graduate course in Economics, and three incompletes, one in Statistical Methods, another in Money and Banking, and the third in an Agricultural Prices course. The transcript carries no additional entries or notations.

3. Mr. ____, age 32, had been preselected in close cooperation with a university in the United States to follow a special academic program of advanced undergraduate and some graduate-level courses to prepare him to return to his country as a full-time professor of sociology.

He had followed the conventional pattern of studies to become an elementary school teacher which consisted of five years of elementary school, followed normally by five years of teacher training for the elementary schools. He also had an additional year of studies in professional education subject matter. For a time he was in the National Education Division of his country and then followed studies at a leading university in his country which resulted in his receiving the first university degree in social sciences with mention of having been the best student during the five years of studies in that program.

The evaluation of his record prior to his coming to this country was that his background was appropriate for his educational objective here and that he was an above-average student in terms of the standards in his country. It was felt that he could work for a Master's degree with deficiencies if that became appropriate.

On arrival in November he made an ALI/GU score of 131 and a TOEFL score of 494. In the SAT verbal he scored 240 and in the mathematics 360. In the interval of his arrival and the beginning of the spring semester he followed preparatory English studies and when tested in January made an ALI/GU score of 159.

English was not his native tongue or the language of his country and he apparently had only two years of English in school. He had followed studies on his own for five months of at least six hours a week. He did not feel that he was ready on his arrival in this country to undertake full-time studies. He rated himself as having been in the upper ten percent of his undergraduate class of 13 students. He felt that his academic record and personal contacts had been very important in his having been selected for studies in this country and that the benefits of his studies would be most importantly the advancement of his own career and the improvement of his country and also of himself as a person.

The institution which had made the prior selection of him received him as a special undergraduate non-degree student. In his first semester he completed six credits of English with grades of B, and a three-credit Principles of Sociology course with a grade of C. In the summer he took an additional two credits of English with a grade of B, a course in juvenile delinquency with a grade of D, and a course in collective behavior with a grade of C. On the basis of his experience with the student before the end of the fall semester, his advisor reported that he was considered a marginal student in terms of all students at his institution and marginal in terms of other foreign students. The student continued in that fall, scheduling nine credits in undergraduate sociology courses in which he made A in six credits and B in three credits. In the spring semester he made D grades in 12 undergraduate sociology credits and dropped one course in sociology. His record bears the notation that at the end of the spring semester 1969 he was admitted to the graduate school. He made a B in a three-credit sociology course in the summer and apparently began working on a thesis. In the fall he programmed 12 semester credits in sociology, receiving an A in three credits, B in six credits, and C in three credits. He had apparently completed the special program planned for him or his time ran out because he left for home at the end of the fall semester.

4. Miss ____, age 39, was sent to this country to earn a Master's degree in Education with emphasis on mathematics that she might return to a teacher's college in her country and also to contribute to the revision of the curriculum in mathematics and help improve the quality of instruction in the secondary school system. She had been teaching in senior high school and had also been teaching in a teacher's college before having been nominated for the studies in the United States.

She had completed the first three-year cycle of university studies at a major university in her country but completion was interrupted and some ten years later she returned to complete the additional two years at the same university. On a scale of five passing and ten high, she had a 6.5 rating. A review of her records shows her to have done her best work in her subjects in mathematics and actually to have performed better in the first three years than in the last two.

Those who reviewed her records for placement in this country considered her an above-average student in terms of the standards in her country. She was felt to have the appropriate background to begin a Master's program in mathematics.

On arrival her ALI/GU score was 240 and her TOEFL 432. Her GRE verbal was 280 and mathematics 720. English was not the language of her country or of its school system but she had taken English for some four years in her schooling and studied some three months for at least six hours a week. She felt that her English was strong enough for full-time studies and that she did not require additional undergraduate subject matter to undertake the advanced work. She felt that her job and her knowledge of English had been very important in her selection to come to this country for her studies.

The institution which accepted her placed her as a regular graduate student in the Master of Arts program in mathematics. They felt that her background was somewhat appropriate. Her official record shows that she received a C in a three-credit modern algebra course, a B in a three-credit history of mathematics course, and a C in a five-credit education course in her first quarter. In the following quarter she received all B grades consisting of a four-credit course in education and eight credits in mathematics. In the spring she made an A in a five-credit modern geometry course, an A in a three-credit course in mathematics in the elementary school, and a B in a four-credit seminar in teaching secondary mathematics. In the summer she received a B in a four-credit linear algebra course and a C in introductory topology. She also made an A in a three-credit course in the history of mathematics and in a one-credit course in piano. In the fall quarter she completed her degree with a grade of A in a one credit seminar in mathematics and a B in a four-credit introductory course in computer mathematics.

The advisor rated her an average student in comparison with other foreign students and average in comparison with all other students. He pointed out that she was in a difficult major with considerable competition from other students younger than she was.

5. Mr. ____, age 32, was sent to this country to complete a Master of Public Administration degree with emphasis on coordinating national and local planning and to design training programs and conduct research and evaluation of programs. He had been with the local administration division of his government since graduation from a leading university in his country with a Bachelor's degree with emphasis on Public Administration.

His undergraduate record indicates that he ranked sixteenth in a class of 21 students. His average on a 60-passing base was 67. The evaluation made of the document in this country considered his background somewhat appropriate and that his record was about an average one in terms of the standards in his country. It recommended him for Master's work without deficiencies.

On arrival in this country in December his ALI/GU test was 224. His TOEFL 426, and his GRE verbal 200 and mathematics 390. Although English is not the language of his country, he studied it 12 years in school and spent at least six hours a week on it for a nine-month period. He did not feel that his English was good enough to undertake full-time studies. He felt that his undergraduate subject preparation was adequate for the graduate program. He considered his job the factor of greatest importance in having been selected for studies in this country and his academic record, English proficiency, and personal contacts of some importance. He felt that the most important benefit from those studies would be to advance his career and the interests of his country and also of himself as a person.

He completed his Master's degree in five quarters and an intervening summer, completing six credits of A, 27 credits of B, and 12 credits of C. He followed the Master's program which did not require a thesis. The campus report tells us that he needed three quarters of English which apparently were not credit courses since they do not appear on his transcript. He was admitted to the program without deficiencies and his undergraduate record was considered marginal for admission to the graduate school. He took a prominent part in activities while a student and was president of his nationality group which the commentator observes demanded quite a little attention and consequently his studies suffered. The faculty advisor rated him marginal in terms of all of the other students and average in terms of other foreign students in the program. The observation is made that he was apparently severely handicapped by lack of English language proficiency. The transcript would suggest, however, that he had done quite well and did not schedule a significantly reduced program in the process of completing his degree.

6. Mr. ____, age 33, was a technician in the Department of Agriculture in pest control and plant production when he was selected to come to this country to earn a Master of Science degree in Entomology to assume larger responsibilities in those areas on returning to his country.

He held a Bachelor of Science degree in Plant Science from a leading university in his country with a 2.20 average on a 4.00 scale. Although his grades were not so strong in the basic sciences, they were particularly good in the subjects in Plant Science. He also had a year of locust control training in a special program at a university in a neighboring country.

On the basis of his records, it was felt that he had appropriate subject matter preparation for his studies and that he was about an average student in terms of the standards of his undergraduate university. It was felt that he would probably need to make up some subject matter deficiencies for the Master's program in Entomology.

On arrival in this country his ALI/GU score was 233; his TOEFL was 438; his GRE verbal was 220 and mathematics 320. He spent about a month in special English preparation before reporting to the institution which was receiving him initially as a nondegree student, with the assurance of change to a degree status if he were successful in his early studies at the institution.

He came from a country where English was not the native language but was the language of instruction in the secondary schools and in the universities. He did not feel that his English was good enough for full-time studies. He thought that he had some deficiencies to make up but that he should be carried as a student at the Master's level. He felt that he had been chosen to come to this country because of his experience and to a certain degree because of his academic record. The benefits of his experience would be most important to his country and his personal development as well as in advancing his career.

In his first quarter the student received a B in a one-credit course having to do with orientation to graduate studies in Zoology. He received a B in a one-credit seminar in Entomology, a C in a five-credit course in Insect Morphology and a C in a five-credit course in Agricultural Entomology. In the winter quarter he received a B in a three-credit course in the biological control of insect pests, a D in a three-credit course in Insect Ecology and a D in a five-credit course in Insect Physiology. In the spring quarter he received an A in a three-credit special problems course in Entomology and a C in a five-credit course in Agricultural Sprays and Dusts.

The faculty advisor commented that his studies at home had been accepted at face value and that after working with him it became clear that he was weak and should have taken some undergraduate courses to strengthen him for the graduate work. Originally a Master's program of two academic years had been projected but because of background deficiencies it would have taken perhaps three or more years to complete a Master's degree. Because he was not accepted as a degree student but rather as a special student, his records were not evaluated in the same way they would have been had he been considered for "full" graduate status. Several times he was programmed for advanced courses but the schedule had to be changed to take courses of a more applied nature because the original courses were too difficult. The advisor observes further that additional work in English was not required but should have been, which of course was also true with respect to additional undergraduate preparation. He further commented that the student should have been placed as a junior rather than as a prospective graduate student. The student discontinued his studies because he could not be admitted to full-degree status. The rating of the student in terms of all students in the graduate program was stated to be marginal and the same rating was made for him in terms of other foreign students who had been in the graduate program. It was further noted that this was the department's second experience with a student from his country and that the first one also had been a weak student because of his poor background.

7. Mr. ____, age 28, came to this country to earn a Master's in Economics with emphasis on financial analysis that he might return to government service to help in establishing a small business advisory service.

He had entered government employ after graduation from a leading university in his country. His record shows that he had a 76 percent in his final year on a passing scale of 60 and that he had ranked twentieth in his graduating group of 257 students.

On reviewing his record before he came to this country, the credential analysts considered his background appropriate and that he was a superior student in terms of the standards in his country and that he was eligible for Master's studies without deficiencies.

On arrival he made a score in ALI/GU of 257. His TOEFL was 524; his GRE verbal was 230 and his mathematics was 550. Although English was not his natural tongue or that of his country, he had studied English 11 years in school and university. He had also been studying it for some nine months on his own at a minimum of six hours each week. He felt that his English was strong enough for full-time studies and that he had the appropriate subject matter background. He felt that his academic record and his English proficiency had been very important in his selection to come to study in this country.

The institution that received him placed him as a regular student in the Master's program in economics without deficiencies, feeling that he had appropriate background. It felt that his record was of average quality in terms of admission standards to their graduate school. While he still had studies in progress his advisor commented that he had been steadily completing his degree requirements and that he was a sincere, capable student very much interested in economics. No attempt was made to compare him with other students in the department.

The transcript shows that after a somewhat modest start, taking all courses in economics with the exception of one in mathematics, he completed all of the course requirements with a grade-point average of 3.20 in two academic years with an intervening summer. The record is not entirely clear but he may have been held over at least part of an additional semester for the completion of his Master's thesis.

8. Mr. ____, age 25, came to this country not specifically for an advanced degree but to acquire additional knowledge, particularly in the areas of industrial organization and management, to return to a teaching position in a leading institution in his country. He was a recent university graduate in mechanical engineering who had some banking experience and also had done some teaching in the field of industrial organization.

As an undergraduate he was quite a good student, ranking sixth in his class. His final average was 8.21 on a 10 high scale with 4 the lowest passing grade. Those who evaluated his record before he came to this country thought he was qualified for graduate studies and that he was an above-average student in terms of the quality of his home country. The possibilities of deficiencies were mentioned in case he were actually to go on for a Master's degree as distinct from just taking subject matter related to his best interests.

On arrival in this country his ALI/GU was 235. His TOEFL was 524; his GRE verbal was 320 and mathematics was 590. English was not the language of his country or of its school system but he had studied the subject for five years and had spent an additional eight months on his own studying English at least six hours a week. He did not feel, however, that his English was strong enough for full-time studies. He felt that he was prepared to study for a Master's in industrial administration. His academic record and job experience, he believed, were very important in his having been selected and he also mentioned that his English proficiency was of some importance in that selection.

The institution which received him placed him in the Master's program with deficiencies. It found that he did not need additional English and that he had an appropriate background. His record was considered an average one for persons accepted by that institution.

The graduate record shows that the student scheduled 15 credits in the fall quarter, earning 9 credits of A and 6 credits of B. He also scheduled another course which he withdrew from but in which he made the grade of B in the following quarter. In fact, all of the grades in that quarter consisting of 12 credits were B and he also was a visitor in a course in data-processing. In the third quarter he had 8 credits of A and 9 credits of B. He also began work on a research topic which the department expects him to do well on and to complete. He returned home at the end of that academic year. He will of course receive his Master's degree if he presents an acceptable research paper. The faculty advisor rated him above average among all students and superior among foreign students in the experience of the division.

9. Mr. ____, age 41, was chosen to come to this country to study for a Bachelor's degree in Civil Engineering to return to resume his military career which had been developed over the years along engineering lines with strong emphasis on administrative duties. He had spent three months in the United States just before returning home to complete his secondary studies. In those months he had completed short courses in budget and in military comptrollership. In addition to his secondary schooling he completed a three-year diploma program qualifying him as a technician in Civil Engineering.

In evaluating his records it was felt that he was an above-average student and that he had an appropriate background for studies in Engineering with the possibility of one academic year of advanced standing credit. It was felt, however, that at his age it might be ill-advised to enter upon a highly competitive program and that he should follow a limited program and particularly limited while improving his English.

Overseas testing showed him to have an ALI/GU score of 222 and testing on arrival in Washington showed that he had fallen off to a 212 score. His TOEFL was 434. His SAT was verbal 314 and mathematics 455.

English was not the language of his country or of its school system, although on arrival he reported that he had studied English two years in school and had spent about six hours or more a week for some eight months.

He had misgivings about his English being strong enough for full-time studies. He felt that he should begin at the freshman level and estimated that he had been in the upper half of his group in his most recent schooling, which was some seven years in the past. He felt that his job had been very important in his selection for studies in this country and that returning to help develop his country was the most important benefit to be expected from his studies.

He was accepted at a well-known university and placed technically in the category of a special student, doubtless to determine on the basis of his performance what advanced standing credit he would receive. In the fall semester he took two courses in English as a second language with no credit or grades reported and he scheduled a five-credit course in algebra and a two-credit course in plane trigonometry, receiving grades of B in both of them. In the second semester he took English as a second language again, and a French course in which he made a grade of A and also a course in analytical geometry with a five-credit value, receiving a grade of B. At that point, 97 semester credits were placed on his record on transfer. Obviously from the subject matter, relatively few of them would have been useful in meeting the degree requirements in Civil Engineering because of their applied nature which was appropriate to the technician's diploma that he had received in his own country. In the first part of the summer he took a standard English composition course for three credits with a grade of C, and he completed a calculus course of three credits with the grade of B. He is then reported to have withdrawn in late October of the fall semester. His withdrawal was probably wise because he had spent more than an academic year in bringing himself up to a point in English and preparatory mathematics to face the challenge of a normal engineering schedule at the university level.

10. Mr. ____, age 25, came to this country after completing three semesters of college-level work in his home country with the objective of completing a Bachelor of Science degree in Geology to return to government service as a geologist in his homeland.

He had completed a year of studies at a private school before his acceptance by a major university in his country. For that work he received on transfer six credits each in English, Chemistry, Mathematics, and General Biology. In his first semester of his sophomore year he received an A in English, World Geography, and in Contemporary Science, and a B in French.

Those who selected him for studies in the United States also had available the grades in his first semester as a sophomore but his other work was still in progress when the admission decision had to be made. His background was considered appropriate for a beginning sophomore and he was considered to have been about an average student within the educational pattern in his home country.

English is the official language of his country and of its schools but it was not that of his home. On arrival in Washington his ALI/GU score was 281; his TOEFL was 614; and his SAT verbal was 431 and mathematics was 414. He considered his English adequate to schedule full-time studies. He estimated that he had been in the upper quarter of the 22 students in his secondary school group. He considered his academic record very important in his having been selected to come to study in the United States. He also felt that he would be appropriately placed academically as a beginning sophomore. It should be noted that the record of his second semester of his sophomore year at home eventually became available in the form of a transcript showing that he had been absent from all of his final examinations. This was probably made necessary because of conflicts in timing in making the change to follow studies in the United States. He gave as very important benefits to be expected from his studies here the advancement of his career, of his country, and of his own self as a person.

The [illegible]nnaire filled out by the person on the campus receiving him stated th[illegible]eceived a regular admission as a first-year student with a somewhat appropriate background and advanced standing of some 58 quarter credits. He was not required to make up background English and was felt to have presented about the average record for persons selected for studies at the institution which received him.

The transcript of record shows that the student received on transfer for his combined studies at the two institutions in his homeland, six quarter credits in Chemistry, five in Algebra and Trigonometry, five in Analytical Geometry and Calculus, five in Special Mathematics, five in Elementary French, and five in World Regional Geography, besides Physical Education. In the fall quarter, his first session in this country, he made a D in Introductory Geology, a C in English Composition, failed an Economics course, and audited a French course. His poor record resulted in an academic warning. In his second quarter he received B in English, and C in French, and in Speech. Failure to bring his average up to the minimum for his level of credits undoubtedly was the reason for his being placed on academic probation. For some reason an additional nine quarter transfer credits were now placed on his transcript for Botany. In the spring quarter he managed to get a B in French and C grades in English Composition, History, and in Hygiene. He was continued on probation. In the summer he repeated the Economics for a grade of C and received an A in Introductory Sociology and a C in the first part of basic Physics. He was continued on probation. The record continues in the same pattern throughout the following fall, winter, and spring quarters in which he received no grades higher than C, one being in Shakespeare and one in Anthropology. Grades of D were received in Physical Geology and in Historical Geology as well as a third course in Geology. He failed the third part of the basic year in Physics. He withdrew in the course of the summer. Clearly in his seven quarters in this country he showed no promise of success in Geology.

11. Mr. ____, age 25, was sent to this country for specialized applied studies in refrigeration that he might return to his position with more knowledge than that which he had hitherto gained on a small scale in the field of air conditioning.

The documentation is not clear but it appears that he had studied overseas and completed the equivalent of secondary schooling under the French system. He then had some two years of technician's training in refrigeration, again in a European country.

On arrival his ALI/GU score was 51 and his TOEFL 320. His SAT verbal was 251 and mathematics 315. Because of his poor English he had to spend the fall semester getting a better foundation for his studies. He was, however, placed for the spring semester at an area technical college and completed ten quarter credits with the grade of B and ten with grade of C in refrigeration courses before returning home.

12. Mr. ____, age 23, was sent to this country not to earn any degree but rather to follow studies as a special student to return in a senior post with his government in a family planning program. He had been with that project since graduating from a major university in his country with what might be considered the equivalent of a junior college certificate of general nature in this country. He apparently had a special gift for communicating both in the written and the spoken language and probably was chosen for special studies here because he had unusual qualifications for leadership and dissemination of the additional knowledge he would acquire in this country.

The review of his records before placement at an institution here considered him to have had an above-average record in terms of the standards in his country but that he really did not have appropriate background for his objectives in what were the equivalent of two years of general university studies in this country.

His ALI/GU score on arrival was 101 and his TOEFL was 348. His GRE verbal was 230 and mathematics 300. Actually he probably should have been tested at the undergraduate level rather than in the Graduate Record Examination.

The student did not provide the information requested about his English preparation and related matters but he came from a country where English is normally the language of instruction in the secondary and more advanced schooling and it had been a significant part of his college studies at home.

The institution which received him placed him in the Master of Arts program without deficiencies and as a regular student with a major in communications. His background was considered appropriate and there appears to have been no question raised about his English competency. He was considered an average student in terms of the quality required for admission to the graduate status.

His record shows that he was programmed mostly in public health subject matter at a rather advanced level. In the fall semester he made a Low Passing in a three-credit seminar in communications and a Satisfactory in a two-credit reproductive physiology course. Then in the spring he made Satisfactory grades in three credits and a Low Passing in a three-credit research project. He scheduled nine credits in the full summer of that year and earned the grade of Passing in them before returning home.

The faculty advisor rated him inadequate in comparison with all other students in that area and also inadequate in comparison with other foreign students. He felt that the student should not have come to this country for studies because he was not as well prepared academically as his higher educational record would suggest. It was also pointed out that he had a physical handicap which interfered with his work and made it difficult for him to adjust to a campus with magnificant distances. One can readily sympathize with the student presumably hobbling around the campus to the successful completion of graduate courses at a reduced load, mistakenly having been placed beyond the evidence of the academic background.

13. Mr. ____, age 32, was chosen to come to this country specificially for an academic program, rather than a degree, to learn about maintenance and servicing of geophysical instruments and also to study computer analysis. He was then to return to government service where he had been employed since receiving his university degree. He was working as a physicist in the geophysical section particularly in the instrumentation and exploration areas. He was a graduate of a leading university in his country in physics and had a 2.48 record on a 4.00 scale. His record shows considerable improvement as he went along and particularly in his senior year.

In considering him for studies in this country on the basis of his records it was felt that his background was somewhat appropriate for his objective and that he was an average student in terms of the grading pattern in his country. For placement purposes it was felt that he might even qualify for Master's studies with some deficiencies.

His ALI/GU score overseas was 176 and on his arrival his ALI/GU was 195. His TOEFL score was 354 and his GRE verbal was 200 and mathematics 400. He had studied English for six years in school and for four months he had been spending at least six hours a week on his own to improve it. He did not feel that his English was good enough for full-time studies. He estimated that he was in the upper 25 percent of his class of some 100 students receiving the degree with him. Although he recognized that he was not in this country to earn an advanced degree but rather to complete a specialized program, he felt that he was ready for Master's studies but with some additional undergraduate preparation.

When he reported to the institution that had accepted him it was decided that his English was not strong enough so that he returned to Washington for additional studies in English. He then registered in the fall semester as a nondegree student who was considered average in terms of the admission standards of the institution. He was thought to have the appropriate background for the special studies.

The institution that received him found it necessary to program him for three credits in English for foreign students in which he made a grade of C. He received a grade of B in a three-credit course in basic geophysics and a B in a special problems course. He did not finish a course on instruments, withdrew from another one in geology, and canceled out of a geophysics course. It is not clear just how much he profited from his semester but he apparently remained in this country, observing and otherwise learning as much as he could in the time remaining before his departure in the summer of that year.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix B-1

WORKSHEET

AID-1380-1X (8-63) **PIO/P** Page 1 of 3 Pages	DEPARTMENT OF STATE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT **PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ORDER/PARTICIPANTS**	1. Cooperating Country	2. PIO/P No.
		3. Project/Activity No. and Title:	

4. Appropriation Symbol	5. Desired Starting Date	6. No. Participants	7. ☐ Original or Amendment No.: ________
8. Allotment Symbol	9. Terminal Starting Date	10. Location and Duration of Training ☐ U.S. ________ weeks ☐ Third Country ________ weeks	

11. AID Financing	AUTHORIZED AGENT	TYPE OF EXPENSE	(A) PREVIOUS TOTAL	(B) INCREASE	(C) DECREASE	(D) TOTAL TO DATE
	AID	(a)				
	MISSION	(b) Int. Travel				
		Maint. Advance				
	AID/W	(c)				
		(d)				
	THIRD COUNTRY	(e)				
		(f)				
		(g)				
		(h)				
12. Cooperating Country Financing	$1.00 =					

13. U.S. Trust Account	A. Trust Account No.	C. Authorized Agent	D. Currency Unit	E. Amount
	B. Allotment Symbol			

14. Special Provisions

15. Mission Clearances	Date	Mission Clearances	Date

The signature of an authorized official of the cooperating country covering this order is on file in the Mission ☐ YES ☐ NO	Date of Original Issuance	Date of this Issuance
16. For the Cooperating Country– The terms and conditions set forth herein are hereby accepted DATE SIGNATURE	For the Agency for International Development	

GPO 873-650

B-2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WORKSHEET

AID-1380-1X (8-63) **PIO/P** Page 2 of 3 Pages	**DEPARTMENT OF STATE** AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT **PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ORDER/PARTICIPANTS**	Cooperating Country	PIO/P No. Project/Activity No.

17. Activity Target for this Training

18. Relationship to Activities of the UN, USIA, etc.

19. Names of participants, kinds of training needed and method of carrying out. Relative emphasis to be given various phases. Problems which this training is intended to solve.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

B-3

WORKSHEET

AID-1380-1X (6-63) **PIO/P** Page 3 of 3 Pages	DEPARTMENT OF STATE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT **PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ORDER/PARTICIPANTS**	Cooperating Country	PIO/P No. Project/Activity No.

19. *(Continued from Page 2)*

20. Contemplated plans for dissemination and use of knowledge gained. Give details.

21. Participant's Future Employment–State what reasonable assurance has been given the mission that the applicant will, upon completion of the training, return to the position he left, a similar position, or superior one.

Appendix C-1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SPACE FOR PHOTOGRAPHS

ATTACH 5 PHOTOS (2" x 2").

DO NOT STAPLE OR GLUE.

Participant's Name And
PIO/P Number Should
Appear On Reverse Side
Of Each Photograph.

AID 1380-2(6-67)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
PARTICIPANT BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

PART I – TO BE COMPLETED BY MISSION

1. Cooperating Country
2. PIO/P Number
3. Project/Activity No. and Title
4. Desired Starting Date
5. Location and Duration of Training
U.S.______WEEKS THIRD CTRY______WEEKS
6. Attachments
☐ TRANSCRIPTS ☐ DEPENDENT CERTIFICATION
OTHER (Specify):

7. A. Future Employment
☐ GOVERNMENT ☐ PRIVATE ☐ JOINT
7. B. Category/Occupation Code
7. C. Economic Activity Code

8. Language Proficiency—TO BE COMPLETED FOR ALL PARTICIPANTS

A. Test Scores and Ratings

(1) English Language Proficiency—ALIGU Test

Date Given		Oral	Usage	Listening	Vocab/Read
	Score:				
	Form:				

(2) Proficiency in Other Language(s) for Third Country Training

Language(s)	Date Given		Speaking	Reading	Other
		Score:			
		Score:			

B. Language Proficiency Status: ☐ TEST NOT YET GIVEN ☐ WAIVED ☐ RETEST NECESSARY

(1) Indicate Approximate Date Scores or Rating to be Reported: ________________

(2) Indicate Type of Waiver and Give Reasons and/or Authority

☐ COUNTRY WAIVER ☐ INTERPRETER(S) TO BE PROVIDED ☐ LANGUAGE ABILITY UNQUESTIONED ☐ SPECIAL PROGRAM

Reason:

(3) Further Language Training is Necessary.
Indicate Approximate Length: IN HOME COUNTRY______________ IN RECEIVING COUNTRY________________

PART II – TO BE COMPLETED BY PARTICIPANT

1. Name (Mr., Mrs., Miss) (Capitalize and underline the one name by which you wish to be called)
2. Sex
☐ MALE ☐ FEMALE
3. Country of Citizenship
5. Address (Street, City or Town, Province) and Telephone No.
5. Date of Birth (Month, Day, Year)
6. Place of Birth (City, Country)
7. A. Name of Spouse
7. B. Date of Birth (Month, Day, Year)
7. C. Place of Birth (City, Country)
8. Number and Ages of Children
BOYS:_____ AGES:_______ GIRLS:____ AGES:_____
9. Dietary Restrictions (e.g., No Pork, No Beef, No Meat)
10. Person(s) To Be Notified in Case of Emergency (Name, Address, Relationship, Telephone No., if any)
A. In Home Country:
B. In Country of Training:
11. If You Have Lived or Traveled in any Country Other Than Your Own, Complete the Following:

Name of Country	Dates (Month and Year) From	Dates (Month and Year) To	Purpose (e.g., Travel, Training, Conference. If for Training, Indicate Type of Program and Sponsor: UN, AID, Univ. Scholarship)

12. Special Qualifications:
A. List Membership and Offices in Professional Societies
B. List Publications, Honors, Awards

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NAME OF PARTICIPANT	COUNTRY	PIO/P No.

13. Education: Total Years of Formal Education: ______

List below in chronological order all schools you have attended. Include primary, middle or secondary schools, universities, vocational or trade schools.

Name of Institution	Major Field of Study	Language of Instruction	Dates Attended		Exact Title of Degree, Certificate or Diploma	Date Received
			From	To		

14. Present Employment: ☐ GOVERNMENT ☐ PRIVATE ☐ JOINT ☐ STUDENT

A. Exact Title of Your Present Position or Occupation	B. Dates of Employment (*Month, Year*) From: To Present Time	C. Number and Kind of Employees you supervise
D. Name and Address of Present Employer (*Firm, Government Agency, Educational Institute*)	E. Kind of Business or Organization	F. Size (*Approximate number of employees*)

G. Description of Your Work in Detail

15. Previous Employment

A. Exact Title of Your Previous Position or Occupation	B. Dates of Employment (*Month, Year*) From: To Present Time	C. Number and Kind of Employees you supervised
D. Name and Address of Previous Employer (*Firm, Government Agency, Educational Institute*)	E. Kind of Business or Organization	F. Size (*Approximate number of employees*)

G. Description of Your Work in Detail

16. Other Employment: (*Use continuation sheet to enter other full time employment for previous 10 years*)

17. Activities or Hobbies in Which You Are Interested (*e.g., Music, Art, Sports*)

18. SIGNATURE

BEFORE SIGNING THIS FORM CHECK TO MAKE SURE THAT YOU HAVE ANSWERED ALL QUESTIONS CORRECTLY.

I CERTIFY that I have reviewed the statements made in this application, and that they are true, complete, and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief and are made in good faith. I further agree that if I am accepted under this program, I will follow diligently the program arranged as requested by my government and will not seek extension of the period of my program. I further agree that upon completion of my training, I will return to my country without delay and will endeavor to utilize, for the benefit of my country, the training acquired under this program

SIGNATURE OF PARTICIPANT

DATE

19.

SIGNATURE OF MISSION OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL TITLE

DATE

NOTE: MISSION—Forward to each Country of Training copies as required by Manual Order 1383.3.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

C-3

AID 1380-2(8-67)

PARTICIPANT BIOGRAPHICAL DATA – Continuation Sheet

Page 3

NAME OF PARTICIPANT	COUNTRY	PIO/P No.

20. Additional Information: Use this space to continue answers to any blocks on pages 1 and 2 for which sufficient space was not provided. Give the number(s) of the block(s) being continued.

21.

SIGNATURE OF MISSION OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL TITLE

DATE

NOTE: MISSION--Forward to each Country of Training copies as required by Manual Order 1383.2.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CREDENTIAL ANALYSTS WORKSHEET

Instructions for filling out this worksheet are given in a separate paper.

1. Name ______________________________
Last (caps) First Middle

2. Age ___

3. Participant No. ☐☐☐☐☐☐

4. PIO/P No. ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

A. GENERAL

5. Cooperating Country

6. Desired Starting Date

7. Duration of Training

a. Funded ______ weeks

b. Projected _____ months

c. Don't Know ☐

8. Degree Objective

9. Major

10. Credentials (List all documents needed for evaluation.)

a. Complete ☐ b. Incomplete - proceed ☐ c. Incomplete - cannot evaluate ☐

11. Training Objective

B. SECONDARY EDUCATION

12. Name of Secondary School

13. Type of Secondary School

14. Name of certificate

15. Date Awarded ____________________ 19____

16. Total years of elementary and secondary education __________

17. Standard years of elementary plus secondary education __________

18. Eligible to try for university admission in home country Yes ☐ No ☐

AACRAO/AID csd 470-form 6704

(Continued on page 2)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

C. POST SECONDARY EDUCATION

Institutions	Degree	Major	Dates	No. of years.	
				Actual	Standard
19.					
20.					
21.					
22.					

D. QUALITY OF CREDENTIALS.

List each document, beginning with secondary school certificate, and show grade average, verbal rating, rank in class, or other indication of quality. Describe the grading scale for each document.

23. Documents	Quality Rating	Grading Scale
a.		
b.		
c.		
d.		
e.		
f.		

E. ANALYSIS

24. Appropriateness of previous academic work for program of study.
    - a. Appropriate............ ☐
    - b. Somewhat appropriate.... ☐
    - c. Inappropriate.......... ☐
    - d. Prerequisites unlikely.. ☐

25. Quality of Participant's academic record in own country.
    - a. Superior............... ☐
    - b. Above average.......... ☐
    - c. Average................ ☐
    - d. Marginal............... ☐
    - e. Inadequate............. ☐

26. Level part. is qualified to begin U.S. study.
    - a. Pre-university... ☐
    - b. Undergrad. 1st yr ☐
    - c. Undergrad. 2nd yr ☐
    - d. Undergrad. 3rd yr ☐
    - e. Undergrad. 4th yr ☐
    - f. Master's with defic. ☐
    - g. " without defic. ☐
    - h. Doctor's........... ☐
    - i. Not qualified....... ☐

27. Participant's objective and past performance indicates he will do satisfactory work at a U.S. institution that is:
    - a. Highly competitive... ☐
    - b. Competitive......... ☐
    - c. Average............. ☐
    - d. Not competitive..... ☐
    - e. None................ ☐

(Continued on page 3)

F. EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION

28.

(For additional space, use reverse side, page 4.)

G. INSTITUTIONS RECOMMENDED BY:

29. USAID	30. AAS
a. ____________________	a. ____________________
b. ____________________	b. ____________________

31. Date ____________ 19____

32. Signature

AACRAO/AID csd 470-form 6704

33.

	Col.	Code
Institutional a. ____________________	73	
Placements b. ____________________	74	
c. ____________________	75	

Appendix E-1

PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

2. Participant No.____________________
3. PIO/P No.____________________
Date Administered____________________

1. NAME____
Last First Middle

4. What language is spoken in your home? 4. ______________________________

5. What is the official language in your country? 5. ______________________________

6. What was the language of instruction in your secondary school? 6. ______________________________

7. If you have attended a university, what was the language of instruction? 7. ______________________________

8. If English was NOT your language of instruction:

a. How many years did you study English in school or university? 8a ________years

b. How long have you studied English outside of school or university?
1. 6 hours or more per week for 8b ________months
2. Less than 6 hours per week for ________months
3. Not at all . . . . . ________(CHECK)

9. Do you believe that your English is good enough for full-time study in the U.S.? 9. ________YES
________NO

10. In which area of English do you have the MOST difficulty? (Check one) 10. ________READING
________SPEAKING
________WRITING
________UNDERSTANDING

11. In which area of English do you have the LEAST difficulty? (Check one) 11. ________READING
________SPEAKING
________WRITING
________UNDERSTANDING

12. What is the name of the highest degree or certificate you have received? 12. ______________________________

13. In receiving your last (highest) degree or certificate:

a. About how many students were in your graduating class? 13a ________Students

b. Where do you estimate you ranked among your classmates? (Check one) 13b ________Upper 10%
________Upper 25%
________Upper 50%
________Lower 50%
________I can not estimate

14. How many years has it been since you last attended a school or university? 14. ________years

15. In what field are you planning to study? 15. ______________________________

AACRAO/AID csd 470-form 6702

16. What institution in this country do you think offers the best program to fulfill your objectives? 16. ____________________
________(Don't Know)

17. At what level do you feel qualified to begin your studies in the U.S.? (Check one)

Undergraduate Program: 17.
a. First Year . . . . . . ________
b. Second Year . . . . . . ________
c. Third Year . . . . . . ________
d. Fourth Year . . . . . . ________

Graduate Program:
e. Master's Candidate (some additional undergraduate preparation necessary) ________
f. Master's Candidate (additional undergraduate preparation not necessary) ________
g. Doctor's Candidate ________

18. What is the highest degree you expect to earn in the U.S. in this AID program? 18.
________None
________Bachelor's
________Master's
________Doctor's
________Other (specify)________

19. Were you asked to apply for this AID program? 19.
________YES
________NO

a. If YES, what is the position of the person who asked you to apply? 19a ____________________

b. If NO, how did you first learn about this program? 19b ____________________
____

20. Check each of the following qualifications to show how important you think each was in your being selected:

a. Academic record Very important____ Some importance____ Not important____
b. Job experience Very important____ Some importance____ Not important____
c. Personal contacts Very important____ Some importance____ Not important____
d. English proficiency Very important____ Some importance____ Not important____
e. Other (specify)____ Very important____ Some importance____
____

21. The following are benefits foreign students might expect to receive from their educational experience in the U.S. Check what you feel to be the importance of each.

a. Advance my career interests Very important____ Some importance____ Not important_____
b. Prepare me for work important to the development of my country Very important____ Some importance____ Not important_____
c. Help me as a person through a broad educational experience Very important____ Some importance____ Not important_____
d. Other (specify)____________ Very important____ Some importance____
____

SIGNATURE____________________________

Appendix F-1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CAMPUS PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE
AACRAO-AID STUDY

Item No.	See Attached Directions	OMIT, for Coding Only	
1.	Participant's Name ______________________________ Last(caps) First Middle	1-20	see
2.	Participant's AID Number................................☐☐☐☐☐☐	21-26	see
	A. ADMISSION		
3.	What is his "major" field of study at your institution? (e.g., agriculture, mathematics, physics)____________	27-29	
4.	What degree is he seeking at your institution?____________	30	
	a. If none, define his educational goal:____________ ____________	31-33	
5.	What type of admission was he granted? 1. Regular____ 2. Regular, with deficiencies____ 3. Non-degree____ 4. Other (explain)____________	34	
6.	Were his admission credentials, as first received from AID/WASHINGTON, complete for making your admission decision? 1. Yes______ 2. No______	35	
	If no: a. What was lacking?____________	36	
	b. What did you do about it?____________	37	
7.	Was he required to take, after arrival on your campus, any additional English or other preparatory work prior to or along with his scheduled program of studies?...................... 1. Yes______ 2. No______	38	

If yes, explain the kind of preparatory work taken and insert either the quarter or the semester credit hour equivalents for that preparatory work.	Equivalents In Credit Hours: Quarter	Equivalents In Credit Hours: Semester	OMIT, for Coding Only	
a. English as a foreign language____________ ____________			39-40	
b. Academic prerequisites____________ ____________			41-42	
c. Other (explain)____________ ____________			43-44	

Item No.		OMIT, for Coding Only	
	B. PLACEMENT		
8.	At what level was he placed to begin his studies? 1. Pre-university......☐ 6. Master's with deficiencies....☐ 2. Undergrad. 1st year..☐ 7. Master's without deficiencies.☐ 3. Undergrad. 2nd year..☐ 8. Doctor's......................☐ 4. Undergrad. 3rd year..☐ 9. Unspecified.................☐ 5. Undergrad. 4th year..☐ 10. Other (what?)____________☐	45	
9.	Did your institution give him any formal placement tests? 1.Yes___ 2.No___	46	
	a. If yes, explain:____________	47	

(Continued on reverse side)

DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE

	1st recording		Change 1		Change 2		Change 3	
	Coded	Punched	Coded	Punched	Coded	Punched	Coded	Punched
Date and Initial								

AACRAO/AID csd 470-form 6706 5-7-68

F-2

(Campus Participant Questionnaire, page 2)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Item No.		OMIT, for Coding Only	
10.	Did your institution grant him transfer credits? 1. Yes____ 2. No____	48	
	a. If yes, how many credits? (1)______Quarter credit hours.........		
	or (2)______Semester credit hours........	49-50	
11.	How many total months of academic study do you estimate it will take him to complete his program of studies after he entered your college?____	51-52	
	C. PREVIOUS PREPARATION		
12.	How appropriate was his previous preparation for his present studies? 1. Appropriate____ 2. Somewhat appropriate____ 3. Inappropriate____	53	
	a. If inappropriate, please explain:________	54	
13.	What, in terms of your institution's admission standards, was the quality of his previous academic record, as judged by your institution at the time it declared him admissible? 1. Superior____ 2. Above average____ 3. Average____ 4. Marginal____ 5. Inadequate____.....................	55	
	D. ADJUSTMENT AND CURRENT STATUS		
14.	Was it necessary to make any unusual changes in his program of studies during the year?............................ 1. Yes____ 2. No____	56	
	a. If yes, explain:________	57	
15.	Has he had any unusual difficulty in personal or social adjustment or in health?.................................. 1. Yes____ 2. No____	58	
	a. If yes, explain:________	59	
16.	Has he left your institution?.................. 1. Yes____ 2. No____	60	
	a. If yes, did he complete his educational objective? 1. Yes__ 2. No__	61	
	b. If he did not complete his educational objective, why did he leave?________	62	
	c. If he left, where did he go and for what purpose?________	63	
17.	Was he ever on academic probation?............. 1. Yes____ 2. No____	64	
	E. TRANSCRIPT		
18.	Please attach a transcript of his record at your institution.............	65	
	Item 19 Revised ☐☐☐☐☐☐ U.S. institution attended	66-71	see
	Column 80 - Card Number 5..	80	5

Submitted by: Name________________ Date________

Institution________________

Address________________ Zip Code________

MAIL TO: Clyde Vroman, Director of Admissions
1220 Student Activities Building
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

AACRAO-AID csd 470-form 6706

5-7-68

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GRADUATE STUDENT SUPPLEMENT #1
Campus Participant Questionnaire
AACRAO-AID STUDY

See directions on reverse side

Participant's (student's) Name ______________________
Last Name (caps) First Middle

Participant's AID Number.. ☐☐☐☐☐☐

As the person most familiar with the above student academically, please rate his overall academic performance up to this time in two respects: (1) in comparison with all other students in his field at his academic level, and (2) in comparison with all other foreign students in his field at his level.

Rating	Per Cent of Class	Check (✓) Each Column Once	
		All Other Students	Other Foreign Students
1. Superior........................	top 10 per cent		
2. Above average..................	next 20 per cent		
3. Average......................	middle 40 per cent		
4. Marginal...............	next lowest 20 per cent		
5. Inadequate..................	lowest 10 per cent		

If there are any unusual circumstances about the academic performance of this student, please comment.

Ratings furnished by: Name ______________________ Date __________
Title ______________________ Institution ______________________

(over)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

To the Graduate Faculty Member or Department Head:

The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers is conducting, for the Agency for International Development, a comprehensive and thorough study of 1,000 foreign students selected and placed in U.S. universities and colleges by AID. The academic success of these "Participants" in their studies here is one of the major criterion variables of the Study. Over half the Participants are graduate students.

The Study Committee believes that for graduate-level work the traditional grade-point average is inadequate as a measure of achievement and success and has prepared this special questionnaire to gather the judgments of graduate faculty members. Accordingly, we are asking you to report on the AID sponsored Participant named on the reverse side of this form who is, or has been, enrolled on your campus.

Before preparing this questionnaire we solicited opinions and suggestions from forty graduate schools. There was strong agreement on the desirability of procuring assessments of success other than grades, but there were many diverse suggestions of alternative and at times complex ways of evaluating the success of graduate foreign student. After considering all the possibilities, the Study Committee decided to use the rating scale provided in the chart. However, we urge you to comment freely on this student as regards his academic qualifications and achievements so that we may better understand your ratings of him or her.

We are grateful to you for your important contribution to the success of this Study.

Clyde Vroman, Study Director, and
Director of Admissions, University of Michigan

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES WHICH ENROLLED THE PARTICIPANTS AND FURNISHED CAMPUS REPRESENTATIVES

An explanation of this list of institutions may be found in Chapter I, page 5. Their names are given below (1) by states, and (2) alphabetically within states.

ALABAMA

Auburn University
Tuskegee Institute

ARIZONA

Arizona State University
Northern Arizona University
University of Arizona

ARKANSAS

University of Arkansas

CALIFORNIA

California State College at Fullerton
California State College at Long Beach
California State Polytechnic College, Pomona
California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo
Chico State College
Claremont Graduate School and University Center
College of the Redwoods
Fresno State College
Humboldt State College
Loma Linda University
Los Angeles City College
Los Angeles Trade and Technology College
Merritt College
Sacramento State College
San Diego State College
San Francisco State College
San Jose State College
Stanford University
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, School of Public Health, Berkeley
University of California, Davis
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, Riverside
University of California, San Francisco
University of California, Stockton

CALIFORNIA

University of Southern California
University of the Pacific
University of Santa Clara

COLORADO

Colorado School of Mines
Colorado State College, Greeley
Colorado State University, Fort Collins
University of Colorado, Boulder
University of Denver

CONNECTICUT

Central Connecticut State College
University of Connecticut, Hartford
University of Connecticut, Storrs
University of Hartford
Yale University

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

American University, Washington
George Washington University
Georgetown University, Washington
Georgetown University, School of Foreign Service, Washington
Howard University, Washington
Johns Hopkins University, Washington

FLORIDA

University of Florida, Gainesville
University of Miami

GEORGIA

Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta
Georgia State College, Atlanta
University of Georgia, Athens

HAWAII

University of Hawaii

IDAHO

University of Idaho, Moscow

ILLINOIS

Eastern Illinois University
Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago
Illinois State University, Normal
Loyola University, Chicago
Northern Illinois University, De Kalb
Southern Illinois University
University of Chicago
University of Illinois, Medical Center Campus, Chicago
University of Illinois, Urbana
Western Illinois University

INDIANA

Ball State University, Muncie
Earlham College
Indiana Institute of Technology
Indiana State University, Terre Haute
Indiana University, Bloomington
Indiana University, Indianapolis
Purdue University, Lafayette
Rose Polytechnic Institute
University of Notre Dame
Valparaiso University

IOWA

Iowa State University, Ames
University of Iowa, Iowa City

KANSAS

Kansas State College
Kansas State Teachers College
Kansas State University, Manhattan
Mount St. Scholastica College
University of Kansas, Lawrence

KENTUCKY

University of Kentucky, Lexington
University of Louisville, Louisville

APPENDIX H-4

LOUISIANA

Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge
Tulane University
Tulane University, School of Public Health

MAINE

University of Maine, Orono

MARYLAND

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore
University of Maryland, College Park

MASSACHUSETTS

Boston College
Boston University
Harvard University
Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University, School of Education
Harvard University, School of Law
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Northeastern University, Boston
Tufts University
Tufts University, School of Dental Medicine
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Williams College
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute

MICHIGAN

Eastern Michigan University
Ferris State College
Kalamazoo College
Michigan State University, East Lansing
Michigan Technical University
Northern Michigan University
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
University of Michigan, School of Public Health
Wayne State University, Detroit
Western Michigan University

MINNESOTA

Dunwoody Industrial Institute
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
University of Minnesota, St. Paul

MISSISSIPPI

Mississippi State University, State College

MISSOURI

St. Louis University, St. Louis
St. Louis University, School of Dentistry
University of Missouri, Columbia
University of Missouri at Rolla
Washington University, St. Louis

MONTANA

Montana State University
University of Montana, Missoula

NEBRASKA

University of Nebraska, Lincoln

NEW HAMPSHIRE

University of New Hampshire, Durham

NEW JERSEY

Princeton University
Trenton State College

NEW MEXICO

New Mexico State University, University Park
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque

NEW YORK

Columbia University, New York
Columbia University, College of Pharmacy
Columbia University, Graduate School of Business
Columbia University, School of Public Health
Columbia University, Teachers College
Cornell University, Ithaca
Manhattan School of Printing
New York University
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
Rochester Institute of Technology
State University College, Plattsburgh
State University of New York at Albany
State University of New York at Binghamton
State University of New York, New Platz
State University of New York, Oswego
State University of New York, Syracuse
Syracuse University
Yeshiva University, New York

APPENDIX H-6

NORTH CAROLINA

North Carolina State University at Raleigh
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

NORTH DAKOTA

North Dakota State University, Fargo

OHIO

Baldwin-Wallace College
Bowling Green State University
Kent State University
Miami University
Ohio State University, Columbus
Ohio University, Athens
University of Cincinnati

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma State University, Stillwater
University of Oklahoma, Norman
University of Oklahoma, School of Medicine, Oklahoma City

OREGON

Eastern Oregon College
Linn Benton Community College
Oregon State University, Corvallis
Portland State College
University of Oregon, Eugene
University of Oregon, Portland

PENNSYLVANIA

Carnegie Institute of Technology
Drexel Institute of Technology
Penn Morton College
Pennsylvania State University, University Park
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia
University of Pittsburgh

SOUTH CAROLINA

Clemson University

SOUTH DAKOTA

South Dakota State University, Brookings
University of South Dakota, Vermillion

TENNESSEE

East Tennessee State University
George Peabody College for Teachers
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
University of Tennessee, Memphis
Vanderbilt University

TEXAS

Rice University
Stephen F. Austin State College
Texas A and M University, College Station
University of Houston
University of Texas, Austin
University of Texas, Galveston

UTAH

Utah State University, Logan
University of Utah, Salt Lake City

VERMONT

University of Vermont, Burlington

VIRGINIA

University of Virginia
Virginia Polytechnic Institute

WASHINGTON

University of Washington, Seattle
Washington State University, Pullman

WEST VIRGINIA

West Virginia University, Morgantown

APPENDIX H-8

WISCONSIN

Milwaukee Institute of Technology
Stout State University
University of Wisconsin, Madison
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

WYOMING

University of Wyoming